

The CLERGY REVIEW

NEW SERIES. VOL. XXII, No. 12. DECEMBER 1942

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF RICHELIEU

IN August 1526 a great Turkish Army, numbering about 100,000 men with more than 300 pieces of artillery, under the command of Solymán the Magnificent, fought and defeated the army of King Louis II of Hungary on the marshy plain of Mohacz. King Louis and a great number of his nobles were killed in the battle, and many more perished in the massacre which followed. Buda and Pesth fell into Solymán's hands, and the line of the Danube was open to the heart of Europe. Two years later Solymán, with an even mightier force and a fleet of boats which "covered the Danube", laid siege to Vienna. A late start and the early arrival of severe winter conditions compelled him to abandon the siege and to withdraw, without, however, being defeated. For the moment the threat to Central Europe and to Germany itself was withdrawn, and Solymán's attention was to turn to the Mediterranean. Yet the threat was to be present along the line of the Danube for almost another two hundred years.

At the moment when the battle of Mohacz was imminent, when the gravest threat to Christendom for centuries was hanging over Europe, an envoy from the court of King Francis I of France arrived in Solymán's camp, asking the Sultan's help against the Emperor Charles V. The event was epoch-making. In its implications it is of far more importance than the battle which decided so much for the fate of Hungary, and indeed of Germany, for hundreds of years. It was the first patent rent in the unity of Christendom—the beginning of a revolution in ideas and in diplomacy out of which the modern Europe was begotten. Francis and Solymán, the Catholic king and the Moslem ruler, made alliance against the great representative of the Christian temporal authority, the ruler of the Holy Roman Empire and all that its ideal connoted. "This alliance," says Mr. J. M. Thompson, "was perhaps one of the most significant fruits of the Renaissance. It marked the end of the mediaeval order, when the Catholic unity of Church and State stood solidly against the infidel and the heretic. It showed that religion was no more the motive of politics than of trade; and that its place was being taken by *raison d'état* or national self-interest."¹

The rivalry between Francis and Charles, against the background of which the Reformation took shape and developed in Germany, was, superficially, a matter of personal animosity between two Renaissance princes. But behind it was the dynastic struggle of Habsburg and Valois out of which was to spring the Franco-Austrian enmity which was to dominate European diplomacy for two hundred years, which was to lay down the

¹ *Lectures on Foreign History, 1494-1789*, p. 56.
Vol. xxii.

political and religious divisions of modern Europe with the Peace of Westphalia in 1648, and in the eighteenth century was to be transformed into the even more momentous antagonism of France and Prussia.

Armand Jean du Plessis de Richelieu, better known as Cardinal Richelieu, the three hundredth anniversary of whose death falls on 4 December of this year, is the most outstanding figure in that struggle out of which the Europe of yesterday had its birth. For eighteen years, from 1624 until his death in 1642, he was the master of France, and to a great extent the arbiter of the fate of Europe. Cold, calculating, efficient, utterly ruthless, he pursued with singleness of purpose a policy which, despite its complications of detail, was in essence simple. At home the monarchy must be made suprême. No rival power must be allowed to stand against it. Hence, the crushing of the nobility as a factor in government, the destruction of the power of the nobles, the beginnings of an idle aristocracy, privileged but impotent in politics, and the development of a paid civil service. Hence, too, the destruction of the Huguenots as a political power, despite their toleration as a religious body. Abroad, France must be freed from the menace of encirclement, ever present with the Habsburg power so strong in Spain and in the Empire. Hence the attack on Austria, the crippling of Germany, bled white in the ghastly prolongation of the Thirty Years' War, and the determination to win for France a strong frontier to the east. So the hand of the French monarchy was strengthened over the "three bishoprics" of Metz, Toul and Verdun, the strong places of Lorraine were brought under French control, and Alsace was incorporated in the kingdom. It is sometimes said that Richelieu pursued a Catholic policy at home and a Protestant policy abroad. It would be a truer judgement to say that religious considerations had no place in his statesmanship at all. What he wanted was a strong France and a weak Germany; and any means which might achieve that end were to his purpose. Hence his alliance with the Calvinists in Holland, with Gustavus Adolphus and with the Lutheran princes in Germany. Hence, too, the stimulation of the war after 1635, to the utter exhaustion of Germany. As a French historian has put it, the honour of France was the Cardinal's prime care, and he left to God the question of the advancement of the true faith. Certainly at home his policy was carried through without scruple, and his enemies or those who opposed his will were ruthlessly removed. His own tribunal, independent of the ordinary courts, the *Chambre de l'Arsenal*, with its midnight executions, made his name feared, and no one was safe who resisted his designs. Twenty-six members of the highest aristocracy were executed under his regime, including a marshal of France and Louis XIII's own favourite. As Mr. David Ogg has remarked with grim humour, "France under Richelieu had little internal history—the death rate among the Cardinal's enemies was too high".¹

It has been argued, with some weight, by his critics that the true springs

¹ *Europe in the Seventeenth Century*, p. 188.

of the Cardinal's action were personal ambition and the pursuit of power. It was his purpose to make himself indispensable to the King, and the maintenance of his own position was his principal concern. The truth is not, I think, quite so crude. There was something else which prompted his action, and that something, a movement in the realm of ideas, was to give a permanent twist to European diplomacy, and to cause a permanent deflection of European thought. Until the beginning of the sixteenth century European diplomacy—and European wars—were governed largely by dynastic considerations. Loyalty was above all a personal matter, conceived as devotion to a prince. The Renaissance and the Reformation stressed the cult of the Ruler, and devotion to the Prince became a dominant influence as the century progressed. The Prince was the prophet of the new religion of Nationalism. *Le Nouveau Messie est le Roi*. By the end of the century the strong urge of Nationalism was affecting the whole of Europe, cutting across the old divisions, breaking the old pattern of Christendom, producing a new delicate equilibrium of power, whose tension was to become an urgent reality to statesmen for centuries. The first exponent of this Nationalism, this new and potent force in the political world, was the French Cardinal. He helped to complete the work which Luther had begun; he made permanent the rupture of the mediaeval unity of Europe, and from divided Christendom produced a mosaic of nationalities. Such is the thesis of Belloc's great book on Richelieu. Others have tempered the judgement to the extent of making the Cardinal less consciously the founder of modern Europe but rather the sport of "those blind and unconscious forces that impel nations to complete their own existence, to achieve their own realization, to hurl down whatever opposes or threatens to encumber, to sacrifice all else that is most precious to the attainment of self-determined organic unity".¹ With minor variations this is the thesis of most modern historians. It is a thesis which, from the French side, might require some qualification. For it can be argued not only that France needed at all costs to break the circle of steel with which the Habsburgs were ringing her about, but that the Habsburg domination of Europe would have been an intolerable evil. It would not have meant the triumph of Catholicism, though it might have meant the crushing of much of the force of Protestantism. More probably it would have meant the shackling of the Church to a triumphant and dominant civil power. Josephism might have become such a menace as to endanger the freedom of the Church throughout the West.

Richelieu, I think, stands for something much more insidious and much more subtle than the glorification of Nationalism. He stands for the realization in practical life of a much more dangerous doctrine, not merely the divorce of politics from ethics, not merely the acceptance of the *raison d'état* as a principle of ethics, but the exaltation of the State to a God-like pinnacle, so that the State itself becomes not merely an excuse, but a very

¹ Sir Stanley Leathes in the *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. IV, p. 145.

source of morality. Pastor saw this, and it is the burden of his severest criticism of Richelieu.

"His ideal was the *State* to which all must bow, the King included, and for him the State was not the twenty million Frenchmen which it embraced, but the man who, having gathered all power in his own hand, alone guided its fortunes. This new system which he applied with ruthless logic whilst he decked it out with the title of *raison d'État*—reason of State—was not limited by any constitutional rights or any considerations of religion or ethics. Whatever stood in the way of this mysterious and awe-inspiring conception of the State must be crushed; whatever could serve it was lawful and even commanded, were it falsehood, treachery, harshness and cruelty."¹

It is this thing, "mysterious and awe-inspiring", the modern State, of which Richelieu is the symbol, not indeed in all its present-day technical efficiency, but in its underlying doctrines. We cannot say that without him the modern State would not have come into existence. Doubtless it would, for the firm ethical and metaphysical bases of society had been lost in the Renaissance and the Reformation. But it would not have developed in the way we know it, with all its ominous threat of domination, had it not been for the example and achievement of the French Cardinal. Machiavelli may have been the forerunner of modern diplomacy and statecraft, but Richelieu, who proclaimed himself a pupil of the Florentine, translated Machiavelli's academic treatise into actuality, turning the abstract doctrine into the concrete achievement. In Richelieu's age, however, it was no longer a question of the Prince and his diplomacy, but the State and its demands. In Richelieu's age State authority and State absolutism became not only accepted *de facto* but proclaimed *de jure*. Bodin's work on *La République*—the sovereign State which has an indestructible *Majesté*, defined, ominously enough, as "absolute and perpetual power"—the works of Althusius and Grotius, with their new and secular conception of Natural Right and Natural Law, the whole basis of International Law as we know it today, come into prominence in this age. And all these are concerned with an entirely new entity, an entity which could not have existed in the Middle Ages or in a truly Catholic culture, but one which has now won universal recognition as a subject of rights, a source of morality, and a claimant of allegiance, the absolute sovereign State. Hobbes was indeed right to entitle his treatise on the State the *Leviathan*, that "Mortal God" to whom we individuals owe our place and our defence. The mediaeval sovereignty of the law was swept away; and the subjective sovereignty of the King which had replaced it was now transformed into the objective sovereignty of the State. No longer, as in the Middle Ages, was the law above all men. No longer, as in the sixteenth century, was the King above the law. The divine right of Kings was absorbed in a new and more terrible divine right. An impersonal soulless thing was clothed in a

¹ *History of the Popes*, Vol. XXVIII, p. 380.

sham personality, and the State like some vitalized Frankenstein was made the source of all power, even the power of the King. There was still some suggestion of a popular basis to this sovereignty, which Rousseau was later to re-affirm, but the publicists of the seventeenth century had as their purpose to establish and justify the existence of an autonomous sovereign entity. As Gierke said with so much reason of the system of Hobbes, this new State-personality was the new secular Natural Right which was proceeding to "convert itself into mere naked power".

It is not necessary to ask whither such a theory of society has led. The results are in the shambles about us at the present time. It is not only exaggerated Nationalism which has dragged men into the paths of injustice. Men have allowed themselves to be deceived by a creation of their own minds, and have invested a human relationship, from which the theological and ethical bases had been removed, with something very closely approaching divine power. Something akin to the pagan God-State has grown up in the midst of us, and Dr. Burkhardt is right in saying that Richelieu and his age saw the beginnings of this trend of ideas, and established the foundations of the new cult which he vividly describes as "State-mysticism".

In the international sphere there is some reaction from this cult of the sovereign State, though in the crisis of war the grip of the State on its citizens seems to fall more and more securely. There is a grim irony in the fact that the man who, more than anyone else, made these ideas of sovereignty a workable reality, was a Cardinal of the Catholic Church. To him, it is true, the red hat was merely a temporal honour, and his elevation to the See of Luçon was due to the fact that the living was in his family's hands, and not to what we should call a vocation. Yet in the early years of his episcopate, before he came permanently to the Court, Richelieu was a model Bishop, bent on the revival and reform of religion in his diocese. But on life, on politics, on diplomacy, his outlook was entirely secular. His view of man and of life was disintegrated, and it is significant that, when he was near his end and was asked to forgive his enemies, he answered, "I have none save those of the State."

If Richelieu is the supreme example of such disintegration of outlook, and of the harm that it can do, we must not think that he is unique. The eighteenth and nineteenth centuries were riddled through with similar notions, which are in fact of the very stuff of Liberalism. Slowly such ideas are being driven from economic life, and Catholic teaching with regard to man is being heard once again. In the international sphere, where the influence of Richelieu was so great, there is still a vast way to go. More perhaps than we realize, our view of the international scene has been coloured by an outlook which owes too much to his achievement. His work has developed for three hundred years, and has borne its terrible fruit. Perhaps our own generation will see the turn of the tide. Pope Innocent X condemned the Peace of Westphalia, truly the work of Richelieu,

though he had died six years earlier, as "null and void, accursed, and without influence". His voice at that time was not listened to in the courts of Europe, nor much, we may imagine, in its episcopal palaces and presbyteries. In our own day the voice of the Papacy has again been raised, not merely in condemnation of all absolutism and any "autonomous" code of morals, but in indication of the true basis of all international relationship. We must not commit the blunder made by Richelieu and his contemporaries, thinking that the actions of men in the international order can be subject to any other norm than the moral law. Perhaps our attention to the voice of Pope Pius XII, and our insistence on his teaching, will help to undo some of the evil which springs so much from the example and the achievement of Richelieu.

ANDREW BECK, A.A.

FINAL DISTRACTIONS

AUG. 30. (First Sunday in September, 14th after Pentecost.) St. Augustine is ingenious (8th lesson) about putting up with the devil and not loving him. Only the verb doesn't mean "putting up with"; it means "clinging to", or "taking part with".

Sept. 1. I cannot understand how St. Giles, at the end of the seventh century, can have been "of royal stock", being an Athenian. Alban Butler hedges, and says he was of noble extraction.

Sept. 2. I like Job's birthday curse, as well as Challoner's explanation that it was not "by way of wishing evil to anything of God's creation". "Raising Leviathan" seems to have been like raising the devil, a feat of the most accomplished kind of enchanter. *Requiescerem cum regibus et consulibus terrae* has a fine ring about it.

Sept. 4. I would like to know who played about with the Friday hymn at Lauds? You can see that it used to be Abecedarian; A, B and C are still initial letters in verse 1, DEFG in verse 2, MNOP in verse 4.

Sept. 5. I see it is recorded of St. Laurence, as proof of his piety, that he said Mass every day. I have always wondered why we are not told this oftener, of Saints who lived before frequent Mass became a matter of course.

Sept. 6 (2nd in Sept. and 15th after Pentecost). St. Augustine gives a happy comparison, in the 9th lesson, between the man who is blind to mystic interpretations and the man who can't read, but likes looking at manuscripts. The hand "of the antiquary" means simply that of the copyist; Forcellini, quoting this passage, says the word ought to mean a librarian. Today's Post-communion is vigorous and unexpected.

Sept. 8. I cannot make out why St. Jerome classes Ruth among the women of whom Scripture disapproves; it does not even seem to regard her conduct as indiscreet. I can only suppose she is marked down as being a Moabitess. What does *qua celsitudo throni processit* mean, in the Benedictus antiphon? "By whom the most High came down to earth" is the Stanbrook nuns' version, but isn't the instrumental ablative rather strange? I have a suspicion that *qua* refers to *nativitatem*, not to *Mariae*, but that doesn't make things any easier.

Sept. 9. It seems odd that the two laurel-trees between which St. Gorgonius was buried should have come in for a mention. But I see it is "between the two Laurels" in the English version; so I suppose (like the Bear with a hat on) it is some topographical indication I ought to know about.

Sept. 12. It is unfortunate that St. Bernard in the 4th, and St. Peter Chrysologus in the 8th lesson should have given two quite different accounts of what our Lady's Name means. Both, I understand, are wrong.

Sept. 14. The fifth and sixth Psalms at Matins are different from those said on 3 May (Feast of the Invention); I cannot understand why. The lessons of today's second Nocturn are quite unique, since they give no account of what the Exaltation of the Holy Cross was, or how or when the feast came to be instituted. If you read the last sentence of the 6th lesson again you will find that the congregation dates back beyond Heraclius; according to the *Catholic Dictionary*, it really refers to Constantine and the Labarum. But I am glad we get the story of Heraclius in the office.

Sept. 15. *En revanche*, only two of today's Matins Psalms, the 5th and 7th, figure in the office of the Seven Dolours as we keep it in Passion Week. These heavy Renaissance hymns make a poor substitute, to my mind, for the *Stabat Mater*. In St. Nicomedes' 9th lesson, surely it is an anachronism to talk about "Count Flaccus", in the time of Domitian?

Sept. 17. I am afraid St. Bonaventure's second Nocturn lessons are an example of the flowery-mediaeval type of Latin prose, which never uses one word where six would do. It seems oddly out of keeping, somehow, with the Franciscan tradition in other things. When they undertook to alter the third verse of *Jesu corona* (never altered except for this feast) they might surely have changed *de corpore* to *in corpore*? Even in the lowest of Latin it is unusual to find *de* losing its meaning so badly.

Sept. 18. Why did it take such a long time to canonize St. Joseph of Cupertino, who certainly suffered from no lack of miracles? He was only beatified, it seems, by Benedict XIV, and has no entry in *Butler's Lives of the Saints*.

Sept. 19. The Benedictus antiphon comes, curiously, from the Benedictus, when we expected to find an extract from the day's gospel.

Sept. 20. I wonder why the Book of Judith starts with "Itaque"? (It is true that some of the prophets, e.g. Ezechiel, start with "And".) The Septuagint is curiously different here from the Vulgate; among other things,

it gives the walls of Ecbatana as 70 cubits high and 30 cubits broad, instead of the other way round—a version which my breviary has preserved, I suppose by a misprint. All the measurements are quite different in the Greek. But the text of the Greek, to judge by the footnotes, seems highly uncertain. I like the words *defenderet se* in the 3rd lesson; there is a fine Nazi touch about them.

Sept. 21. I wonder whether that is St. Jerome's own idea, at the end of the 8th lesson, about the super-magnetism of our Lord's presence?

Sept. 22. I have always liked St. Thomas for having had to borrow his bed back again, to die in it.

Sept. 24. I can find no explanation of why this feast is kept in September, a month in which our Lady already has three feasts, whereas in October she has only two and in November only one.

Sept. 27. I had always wanted to know what exactly those colours were in the second lesson. "Sky-coloured and green and violet", the Stanbrook nuns call them; but I find on reference that they do not occur in the Hebrew or in the Greek, which just give you tents of linen and cotton.

Sept. 28. Dr. Neale seems to have taken liberties with the story of St. Wenceslas; it was when he was going on pilgrimage to the churches that he left warm footprints in the snow. The Saint did, I see, carry pine-logs round to the poor; but surely, not for a whole league's distance? There must have been fuel nearer to hand.

Sept. 29. It bothers me that St. Gregory, in the 5th lesson, should quote Psalm ciii, 4, basing his whole argument on the view that it means "Who makest thy spirits angels", whereas our Bible has "Who makest thy angels spirits". Modern commentators agree with St. Gregory over the construction, but want it to be "winds", not "spirits".

Sept. 30. Does *Graecae fidei reddidit* in the 6th lesson mean "He faithfully translated the New Testament from the Greek" (as the Stanbrook nuns say), or does it mean that he corrected the existing Latin text so as to bring it into harmony with the Greek? Maldonatus says roundly that St. Jerome did not translate the New Testament, he only corrected, in certain places, the old version of it.

Oct. 2. It is a gracious coincidence, that the Guardian Angels should have the same Gospel as Soeur Thérèse has tomorrow. It is interesting, too, to note that St. Robert Bellarmine, who wrote both today's hymns, is preoccupied with the idea of Guardian Angels who watch over the destinies of nations, rather than individuals.

Oct. 3. I think this is the only day in the year when we ask, in the Collect, for simplicity of heart. Which would argue, that there are always fresh facets to be discovered in the crown of sanctity.

Oct. 4 (1st of Oct. and 19th after Pentecost). I like the phrase, used of Alexander the Great in the first lesson, *Et siluit omnis terra in conspectu eius*. The third responsory shows that the rather irritating application of *quia*

after *Da pacem, Domine, in diebus nostris* is quite gratuitous. The end of the sixth lesson would be impressive if we had not come to think of elephants as comic animals. The seventh Responsory has something of the artist's vision about it.

Oct. 7. I am always bothered, in saying the office of this feast, by trying to remember how the fifteen mysteries will be fitted into the fourteen antiphons of Matins and Lauds. Actually the fourth and fifth sorrowful mysteries are telescoped.

Oct. 8. It is difficult to see how Ulfo can have got leave to become a Cistercian while his wife was still in the world. Some authorities, according to Alban Butler, maintain that he had not taken any vows when he died.

Oct. 9. St. Paul, in 1 Cor. i, 2, addresses his letter to the Corinthians "and every place of theirs". Would this include Athens? If so, the first sentence of the 5th lesson seems out of keeping with 1 Cor. i, 14-16.

Oct. 10. I think St. Francis is the only Saint of whom the breviary records that he knew by instinct where the Blessed Sacrament was reserved (see 6th lesson). In the last sentence of this lesson, the operative word is *demum*.

Oct. 11. Are not the versicle and response of the third nocturn, and of Lauds, rather untrue to type? In one case, they don't seem to fit on properly; in the other they are surely too long.

Oct. 13. I am bothered by the first sentence of the 4th lesson, which seems to leave no room for King Harold. Apparently the *Ecclesia orans* treats him as a usurper. The sentence in the 6th lesson which begins with *Quare* looks too much as if it meant to imply that the Confessor purposely died that day, so as not to frustrate the prophecy. I have always been surprised (as well as glad) that his office should have been extended to the universal Church; why did they want to, just then? Innocent XI was not distinguished by his love of Catholic England.

Oct. 14. St. Callistus' name is not mentioned in his collect; is this the survival of some early Roman tradition? You can say the same of St. Felix on 14 January, St. Felix and St. Adauctus on 30 August; the only other instances I have collected (but I dare say there may be others) are those in which a cumbrous list of names was involved (e.g. 19 January).

Oct. 15. St. Theresa died on Oct. 4, St. Francis' day, and it was therefore arranged that her feast should be kept on the day following: i.e. Oct. 15. And why not Oct. 5? Because it was *juxta Kalendarii Romani emendationem*; she died in 1582, and in that year the dates Oct. 5-Oct. 14 do not exist—they were eliminated so as to put the Calendar straight. (In England, we did not toe the line till 1752, when there were loud cries of "Give us back our eleven days".)

Oct. 17. *Magnis propositis caelestis thesauri praemiis* (5th lesson); the Church does not mention the Nine Fridays, here or in the office of the Sacred Heart.

Oct. 18. There is, it seems, a curious conflict of traditions over the Vol. xxii.

question whether St. Luke was martyred or not; the breviary does not say so. The statement that he lived to be eighty-four is, apparently, untrustworthy; one certainly wonders why he never published his third volume.

Oct. 20. Today's 5th lesson is, for me, the high spot in the recitation of the Divine Office; I do not know any story to match St. John Cantius and the robbers, unless it be that of the Moravian who was indicating to some invading troops the fields which could most usefully be devastated, and, when the officer asked "Why not this one?", explained, "I'm afraid this one doesn't belong to me." The scansion of the eighteenth-century hymn is rather uncomfortable.

Oct. 24. Throughout the second Nocturn, St. Bonaventure gives you Scriptural references by chapters; this is an agreeable change from the practice of earlier writers, who just mentioned the book and left you to read it through; *Lege Numerorum librum*, and so on. When did "chapter and verse" effectively come into operation?

Oct. 25. The Feast of Christ the King is ruined for me by wondering what the printer is going to do next. He has evidently set out (in my breviary) to give *Rex* a capital R all through, but breaks down in the first psalm of the third Nocturn. (But it must be admitted that the traditional printing of the breviary is not uniform in this respect.) In the 5th verse of the Matins hymn you get quotation marks. As far as I know, this is the only instance of their use in the liturgy; might they not have been omitted? In my breviary—let me be honest, it is a pagella, which dates me, I'm afraid—I am spared the use of capital letters for pronouns. But the very modern Missal which stood on the altar today gave me capitals even for relative pronouns, going beyond the worst horrors of ordinary sacristy printing. I'm afraid I don't like the day's office much, anyhow. In the Lauds hymn, *Domesticis virtutibus* is perhaps the least good line in the whole of Catholic hymnology. And, while I admire everything else about the late Holy Father, I do not always admire his Latinity, which seems almost tortured. In the last sentence but one of the fourth lesson, *amatum iri* quite certainly ought to be *amari*.

Oct. 26. An interesting point arises about the Monday's lessons. Does the doctrine of Inspiration require us to believe that Jeremias hid the tabernacle (single-handed) in a cave? Or only to believe that the "Descriptions of Jeremias" said he did?

Oct. 28. The collect for St. Simon and St. Jude would be a real teaser to translate. The Stanbrook version, "Grant that by advancing in virtue we may celebrate their everlasting glory, and also that by celebrating their glory we may advance in virtue", can hardly be called snappy. "Grant that we, who tell of their everlasting glory, may praise them by mending our lives, and mend our lives by praising them"? I suspect you would have to go still further away from the original.

Nov. 1. What a curious interpretation it is, really, that St. Augustine

gives (in the 9th lesson) of "Blessed are the poor in spirit". Because the proud are sometimes described as "puffed up", he takes *spiritus*, "breath", as equivalent to pride, and the people who are in this sense short of breath (deflated, you might say) are the humble. But if St. Matthew's Beatitudes are to correspond with St. Luke's, poverty of spirit should, surely, mean detachment rather than humility? (Not that we said the 9th lesson this year.)

Nov. 2. You would have thought it would be difficult to fit out All Souls' Day with a complete set of Psalms, yet how admirably it is done! You get *hints* of Purgatory all through: *Incolatus meus prolongatus est . . . Neque luna per noctem . . . Si ambulavero in medio tribulationis . . . Dominus solvit compeditos . . . Neque habitabit juxta te malignus . . . Consumetur nequitia peccatorum, et diriges justum . . . Credo videre bona Domini in terra viventium*, and so on. We are so often reminded of our bodies being the instruments of sin, that it is a pleasant change to have them described by St. Augustine (4th lesson) as "organs and vessels which the soul put to a holy use". The office of the Dead is surely the most *impressive* thing in the liturgy; it breeds, in the least imaginative, a complex mood of gloom and hope.

Nov. 4. The last words of the 5th lesson seem to suggest that St. Charles was hit by a cannon-ball. Actually it was a shot from an arquebus.

Nov. 6. How fond pious authors are of making lists of things, and comparing them! What St. Augustine has been leading up to is an identification of the seven Gifts of the Spirit with the eight Beatitudes. But he has to put the seven Gifts in an artificial order of his own; and when he has done that, the result he gets is that fear is the special gift of the humble, meekness of the godly, knowledge of the mourners, fortitude of those who hunger and thirst for right, counsel of the merciful, understanding of the pure-hearted, and wisdom of the peace-makers. I hope it is not impious to have a feeling that all this is misplaced ingenuity.

Nov. 7. Why is King David called *lenis* at the end of the 5th lesson? I don't think the Stanbrook nuns should have translated it "mild"; surely that is a bad description of him? I suppose it means that he spared the life of King Saul.

Nov. 8 (2nd in Nov. and 24th after Pentecost, i.e. 5th after Epiphany). The first lesson finishes with fine rhetorical effect on the word *irrevocabilem*.

Nov. 10. I had always been baffled by the words *e regione* in the middle of the 9th lesson, and had vaguely supposed it was bad Latin for "from the sky". But the Stanbrook nuns translate "as if in choir"; and indeed, I see on consulting the dictionary that even in classical Latin *e regione* can mean "directly opposite".

Nov. 11. It is bad luck on St. Martin, that we should be directed to take the hymn, *Iste confessor*, from the Common; I am told it was written for him in the first instance—it is rather like St. Thomas of Villanova

and his bed. I had always imagined that *Ambiani* in the 4th lesson was the name of the beggar, but I see it means "at Amiens", a very odd intrusion at that point in the sentence. I have never understood why St. Martin's disciples should have wanted him (6th lesson) to lie face downwards; it seems a curious prescription for acute fever. Why *Trinitatis Deificae* (1st responsory)?

Nov. 13. What exactly was San Diego quoting on his death-bed? It looks like a blend of the 7th responsory and the Magnificat antiphon of Holy Cross day. Anyhow, I like him for being so taken up with the office of Holy Cross.

Nov. 14. It seems unusual to form an accusative Josaphatum from the nominative Josaphat (5th lesson). It is a pleasant reflection, nowadays, that England and Poland have produced brother-Saints, with the same gospel.

Nov. 17. I am fond of St. Gregory's diocesan statistics in the 5th lesson; a yearly reminder to priests not to pitch their pastoral ambitions too low.

Nov. 20. The words *Deo sic disponente* in the 6th lesson, always give me pause. Are we to suppose that Divine Providence was positively responsible for the monks oversleeping, or was it merely a *felix culpa*?

Nov. 21. *In domo probaticae Joachim* is an odd phrase (4th lesson). The Stanbrook translation is "in the house of Joachim by Probatica"; but my breviary has a small P, and I suppose the sense, taken thus, must be "the house attached to Joachim's sheep-fold".

Nov. 22 (4th of Nov. and last after Pentecost). I cannot make head or tail of the sentence which ends the 5th lesson. It is reminiscent of the Greater Antiphon for Dec. 22, in which the King of the Gentiles is hailed as "the Corner-stone that makes both one", as if the Jews and the Gentiles were two walls united in Christ as Corner-stone. But the phrase "who makest both one" is taken from Eph. ii, 14, where the metaphor is quite different—that of a mason who pulls down a party-wall to throw two rooms together.

Nov. 23. The fifth responsory of today's feast is at once arresting and confusing. Does it mean, "The Lord has sent me to be a partaker of your (heavenly) crowns, but not for any merits of mine"? Or is the sense, "The Lord has not sent me to become a partaker in your (earthly) crowns through my own merits"?

Nov. 26. I always imagined from that picture (I forget whose) that St. Catherine's body was taken to Mount Sinai immediately after her martyrdom. But I see (in Alban Butler) that the translation took place in the eighth century; so perhaps the rationalistic explanation of "angels" as monks has something to be said for it.

Nov. 28. Remember that you want the *Pars Hiemalis* for Vespers, not merely for anticipating the night office.

R. A. KNOX.

THEOLOGICAL REVIVAL

IN his work on *The Making of Europe* Mr. Christopher Dawson recalls the popular interest which was excited under the Byzantine Emperors by theology. "And so," he says, "while the people took no share in the politics of the Empire and the affairs of the secular government, they followed with passionate interest the affairs of the Church and the religious controversies of the age. It is difficult for us to understand an age in which the clauses of the Athanasian Creed were matters of passionate debate at street corners, and abstruse theological terms like 'consubstantial' and 'unconsubstantial' became the battle-cry of rival monks. No less an authority than St. Gregory Nazianzen has described how, if you went into a shop in Constantinople to buy a loaf, 'the baker, instead of telling you the price, will argue that the Father is greater than the Son. The money-changer will talk about the Begotten and the Unbegotten, instead of giving you your money, and if you want a bath the bath-keeper assures you that the Son surely proceeds from nothing.'"

That, of course, was a long time ago and among a people who may be supposed to have had little in common with ourselves. Yet, among certain elements of our own population, a similar interest has, at no very distant period, manifested itself. There is striking testimony to this in a book, published in 1900, on *The Welsh People*. "About thirty years ago," say the authors, "an English professor of theology and a Welsh preacher were taking a morning walk in a very Welsh county, and sat down to rest awhile in a field. Nearby two labourers, who were finishing their mid-day meal, were talking in Welsh. Their loud tones and excited gestures excited the attention of the visitors. Said the Professor: 'Are they quarrelling?' 'Well,' replied the Preacher, 'they are not quarrelling more than is usual in a debate on a theological point. They are discussing the question whether Christ had two wills or one. The Monothelite controversy is revived.' For the benefit of the Professor the Preacher translated the conversation as it proceeded, and the judgement of the former was that the arguments urged by each disputant were as subtle as any of those to be found in the old books."

It is extremely unlikely that anything approaching this popular concern for theological problems will be repeated today and among English folk. It would seem, however, that there is a disposition to dig up this forgotten subject and to pay it the respect which it has so long lacked. It was only the other day that a regular contributor to that organ of Nonconformist Liberalism, the *Manchester Guardian*, who calls himself "Artifex", wrote, under the simple heading "Theology", an article which was from beginning to end a plea for this study. It was with pleasurable surprise that, having for so long listened to assertions from this quarter that Christianity was a matter of character to which creeds and doctrines were irrelevant, one read how

in neglecting theology the "leaders of the Churches" were failing to mind their proper business. They are, declared the writer, "busy planning the post-war world and give us their views on politics, economics, finance, and sociology. The one science on which they are strangely silent is their own science of theology." Criticizing the Archbishops' Commission on Doctrine, he wrote: "Of any attempt to state what the Church really does hold, or to display Christian doctrine as a coherent system of thought and a possible attitude towards the whole of reality, there was not a sign." And he concluded by saying: "Yet the intimate connection between belief and practice, the dependence of morals on theology, is certain. As long ago as 1915 a very thoughtful writer said: 'If there is one thing that can be said with absolute certainty . . . it is that the revolt against the Christian ethic is due to the previous repudiation of the doctrines upon which it is founded. The two things, belief and conduct, are indissolubly bound together.'" That such things should be said in a daily newspaper of the *Guardian's* liberal traditions may be taken, surely, as a sign of the times which is worth examining.

To this must be added, as evidence of the same tendency, the declaration of Dr. Joad, which, a short while ago, astonished readers of the *New Statesman and Nation* and which was repeated in the *Evening Standard*. In this the popular broadcaster, discussing the future of "the churches", said: "For thirty years or more the churches have been growing broader, looser, and less exclusive. The tendency has been to throw down barriers, to blur the hard and fast lines of dogma, above all to soft-pedal the supernatural implications, the other-worldly affirmations of Christianity. . . . If religion is ever again to matter, it must reverse the engines and become hard, dogmatic and exacting." We are accustomed in times of war to what it is usual to dignify by the name of religious revivals, emotional movements which do little or nothing to stimulate interest in theological questions. Today, it would appear, there is a disposition to reassess in the light of the painful experiences through which we are passing doctrines which it was supposed had been finally discredited. It is this theological approach to religion which makes Dr. Joad's statement so significant. Let us therefore attempt to discover what it is which is leading to the rehabilitation of theology!

One of the reasons has been already mentioned. I refer to the confession made by the writer in the *Manchester Guardian* that "the revolt against the Christian ethic is due to the previous repudiation of the doctrines upon which it is founded". Modern amorality is producing results which is making plain to all the nineteenth-century fallacy which asserted that Christian ethics were independent of Christian dogma and would be unaffected by the loss of faith in religious doctrine. The first generation of agnostics were successful in keeping up the illusion. Perhaps it was that they made a special point of moral austerity in order to vindicate their theory. Certainly no one would charge with hedonism and frivolity the

mandarins of Victorian unbelief. Even the modern craze for debunking the great has not succeeded in attaching scandal to their names.

But the precarious hold of the good agnostic on traditional morals has not been maintained. Belief in the Christian Code has followed belief in the Christian Creed. What even the most daring of Victorian sceptics would have shrunk from avowing is now openly and unblushingly confessed. The frightening character of the moral landslide which has taken place, especially in regard to sex, has caused the thoughtful to re-examine the facile assurance of the previous generation. They are now inclined, as a consequence, to consider whether, after all, there may not have been wisdom in the repudiated orthodoxy.

A further reason for the return to theology is more closely related to the war. This has posed in an acute form the old problem of evil. How, in the face of all the suffering which war inflicts, the critical ask, can you believe in a good God? The objection is an old one, but the tragic breakdown of our civilization has given it a new lease of life. At the same time, answers are being found which strike a fresh note. It is, in fact, precisely the existence of evil which is inducing belief. The argument takes two forms.

"If this war had not broken out," a New York Rabbi is reported to have said, "I should have doubted the justice of God. A generation so forgetful of Him had to be reminded that Divine Justice is no myth." That point of view may not be common, but for those familiar with the Old Testament it is not an unnatural one.

Professor Joad puts it in another way. "Evil, then—there seems no escape from the conclusion—is endemic in the heart of man," he says. "But to believe in the reality of evil and to have no recourse against it save such as lies in the sporadic efforts of one's own will and the slender integrity of one's own judgement, that is, for me, a frankly intolerable position. There must, one feels, be some outside source from which assistance can be invoked." 'So there is,' says religion; 'there is God, and if, believing, you pray to Him, Grace will be vouchsafed, whereby evil may be resisted. Hence arises the paradox, that one is driven to believe in the existence of a benevolent and participating God precisely because of the fact of evil.' It will be noted that the difficulty takes the form of a problem to be solved.

The writer of the passage quoted is a philosopher. That is the interesting thing; Christianity is seen to offer intellectual satisfaction. But the problem is not only a personal one; it is a social, one might almost say, a political one, or, at least, it has been treated as such. The war is not only one of armaments but, also, of ideologies. Social and political movements on the Continent have become pseudo-religions and have provided themselves with dogmas which one denies on pain of excommunication. These dogmas propose a certain philosophy of life and a certain interpretation of history. In contending with the forces which represent these ideologies, British humanitarianism feels itself at a loss. Idealistic and moved by

generous impulses, it is becoming aware that this is not enough; authority is needed to unite and to evoke the necessary sustained devotion. Something harder and more exacting than a good-natured desire to see everybody happy is required. Mr. Victor Gollancz, in *Russia and Ourselves*, has described the effect produced by this lack of a theory. "The initial inspiration of the socialist movement in all countries and in all its phases," he writes, "was not a theory of human history but a passionate and consuming faith. In the case of the British Labour Party this faith was never seriously reinforced by a scientific theory: and the faith itself grew old and tired. The result is that in our own day the steam that drives the Labour Party is not of high pressure, nor is the rudder that steers it firm or sure. To recover the old faith in all its glory is the first necessity; but sound theory is no less important." The words which I have italicized in the following passage from a little book by Dr. Friedmann, entitled *World Revolution* published by the Rationalist Press in "The Thinkers Library", is an almost plaintive demand for a theory that will sustain our native humanitarianism. Says Dr. Friedmann, speaking of the possibility of co-operation between Christians and humanitarians: "The common background lies in the crisis which has revealed a deep cleavage between technical achievement and moral insufficiency, and has produced a spiritual revolt against the threatened abyss of nihilism and destruction, a greater diffidence and modesty regarding the progress of mankind, and a reaction from a predominantly economically inspired ideology towards a new one, *the outline of which is not very clear.*" The theory which put economic values first has failed and, so far, nothing has taken its place; that is the situation. It will be pointed out, of course, that Christian doctrine cannot be regarded as a supplement to social aspirations. It is infinitely more than what is generally understood by the term "ideology". Yet we cannot overlook this factor as contributing to the interest which is showing itself in the Christian scheme of things. After all, it was what might be called the messianic ideology of Our Lord's Jewish contemporaries of which the Apostles availed themselves to explain His appearance and to expound the teaching which centred round His Person.

So far as the Catholic public is concerned, we must take into consideration the increasing need, in view of Catholic Action, for an instructed laity and the attention that is being given in that connection to the work undertaken by the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine. This is, perhaps, more evident in the United States than here. The formation of parochial groups (sometimes two or three groups in the same parish) under the direction of instructed laymen appointed by the priest is quite common. In conjunction with the Liturgical Movement, also strong, these groups are forming a generation well able to give a reason for the faith that is in them. Between the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine and the Liturgical Movement there is a certain interdependence and the combined effect should be to transform the Catholic laity, equipping it spiritually and intellectually for the great work of the apostolate to which it has been called.

There remains to be considered, however, the particular kind of theological emphasis which we may expect as the result of the circumstances under which this revived interest in theology is manifesting itself.

The quotations given from Professor Joad's articles indicate one phase of the effect likely to be produced by the contemporary situation. As we have seen, the apocalypse of evil which has been given to our age has produced in his case a more tragic view of human nature than that characteristic of the superficial optimism from which the war has delivered us. On every hand are signs of a reaction against that belief in progress of which Mr. H. G. Wells seems to be the sole outstanding representative. The war has given Utopianism a rude shock and that shock has sent enquiring minds probing at the roots of human nature. What is it, they are asking, that is the matter with us? Why is it that, in whatever we undertake, there is some fatal flaw? The story of human disillusionment seems unending. Our faith in our revolutionary slogans, in the pagan emancipation from morals, in science is shattered. What is the explanation? It is true we still cling desperately to the hope that, in some mysterious way, a victory for the Allied Nations will give us a new and better world. But that is largely due to propaganda and, even now, is regarded by the more thoughtful with scepticism. It is scarcely a wonder that it should be found necessary to fall back on the Church's doctrine of Original Sin.

Nor could any better beginning for a reconsideration of Christian teaching be found than that which acknowledges man's helplessness and need of supernatural assistance. This brings into view the whole Christian system of soteriology. We are, in fact, in much the same position as that dying world which evoked St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans. It becomes comprehensible that the generation which listened to the first preaching of the Gospel should have welcomed it as offering nothing less than a passage from death unto life. In the context of our own age, the Gospel of St. Paul, apostle and theologian, acquires a new vitality and a meaning closely relevant to our own situation. That terrible indictment of our race and glorious evangel can now be translated in a manner which can make its intricate and subtle reasoning apprehensible by the twentieth century. It becomes under our present circumstances a living document apposite to the deepest problems of our time. Given the radical nature of the disease diagnosed (and there is an increasing willingness to acknowledge the accuracy of the diagnosis) there is no remedy other than that proposed.

The Epistle to the Romans has been the favourite text of religious individualism. But religious individualism is passing and giving place to a sense of racial solidarity. If we are to overcome the racial fanaticism of particular peoples it will be only through the sense of human solidarity in a common guilt. The discovery of our oneness in "the Old Adam" precedes and conditions our discovery of "the Second Adam". It is only as implicated in the guilt from which He saves us that we can appreciate the Gospel of Salvation through Christ. The vision of Him which we need is that of the

Saviour and this will be given us whenever we come to realize our corporate need of salvation.

In addition to the vision of Christ as Saviour and the theological implications of this, the social consciousness which is a distinguishing feature of our generation demands that He be presented to us through the medium of a Divine Society. It is only this Society which can save society. And it will do so not merely by the ethical teaching of which it is the appointed guardian but by its very constitution. The description of the Mystical Body given by St. Paul may serve as indicating the social ideal in the broadest sense of the term. In the study of this subject theology and sociology meet. There is thus thrown open to us a wide range of theological interest closely relevant to the deepest and most passionate demands of the present age. The Saviour Who mediates salvation through the sacramental agencies of this Divine Society is One Whom our generation is specially prepared to understand.

The writings of St. Paul have a different emphasis from that of the Apocalypse. The second sounds a note which is particularly liable to recur at times like these. The occurrence of changes in human affairs on the scale now observable inevitably suggests to the imagination the relation between history and the Divine Judgement. We have quoted the remark of a Jewish Rabbi to the effect that if the war had not happened, it would have been, indeed, difficult to believe in the justice of God. The mood indicated by that remark is fairly widespread, and, as the horrors increase, must become more intense. It would not be surprising if the religious mood generated were to be of an apocalyptic character. Even where it is not accepted, there is room, as St. Paul's warnings to the Thessalonians show, for a treatment of the subject involving an exposition of the theology of the Last Things. History is a great sacrament and when it is of the character given it by contemporary events can move the popular mind to an apprehension of the Divine Presence in the world in a way which disposes men to listen to what the Church has to say on the matter. The opportunity for expounding the relevant theology is great. If it is not seized by authoritative teachers it will be exploited by those false prophets, of whom the earlier H. G. Wells was a sample, to curdle the blood of the credulous.

The form which might be taken by a revival of interest in theology is thus apparent. And concerning it we can say at least this much: there is no probability that the renewed study of this subject will be of a merely academic character. There have been men, even among the unbelievers, who have been intellectually fascinated by the problems posed by the Queen of Sciences, but they are few. The situation is not altogether dissimilar to that which saw the birth of Christian Theology. St. Paul thought and wrote, it may be remembered, under a heavy sense of the problem created by clashing racial claims. Beneath the external unity produced by the Roman Empire there was, as between Jew and Gentile, an inner dissonance which, if ever a real unity was to exist, must be overcome. To this social

problem his theology was intimately related, and this relation gave to his teaching a vital interest for his contemporaries which, reading his Epistles abstracted from the background of his age, we are apt to miss.

The Arian controversy, again, aroused popular concern because it was associated in the minds of the generation concerned with certain political questions. The Empire being Arian, the Catholics were regarded as disloyal to the imperial authorities.

The apathy with which our generation has regarded theological matters has been due in part to the fact that they seemed remote from our mundane affairs. Once it is realized that they have a close bearing upon the present social and political situation a different attitude will be adopted. And, while this has its dangers, it is also full of promise. The benefit would be not all on the side of the uninstructed laity now supplied with an approach to the subject which they can appreciate. The practical implications of Catholic doctrine, once seen, cannot but charge the atmosphere in which it is studied with a vitality that has been too often lacking. It has been said that the passion once associated with theological controversy has been diverted to the discussion of social and political problems; the intense interest excited by these latter is due to the fact that they fill the vacuum left by the decay of interest in doctrinal questions. What if the process were to be reversed, and the passion which is now devoted to the exposition of Fascism, Socialism, and Communism were to manifest itself with regard to the articulation of religious beliefs and practices? Lest that be thought an extravagant phantasy, let me close with another quotation from one of Professor Joad's recent articles. "It is no accident, then, on my reading of the situation," he wrote in the *New Statesman and Nation*, "that one begins to find among young people discussions of the means of overcoming temptation, the technique of prayer and the possibility of loving one's fellow men, taking place side by side with, sometimes even taking the place of, evolution versus revolution in politics and the Marxist analysis of change." The Constantinople described by St. Gregory Nazianen may not be so remote from the modern world as we have thought.

STANLEY B. JAMES.

A GREAT WELSH PRIEST

FEW people know the story of Fr. Henry Bailey Hughes, the great Welsh convert and pioneer who died towards the end of the last century. His apostolic work in Wales was of brief duration, and, humanly speaking, it failed to yield any outstanding or lasting results. Cautious critics have averred that he was a man whose zeal exceeded sound common sense and

that his energy and undoubted talents could have been more profitably employed in other directions. Be that as it may, none can deny that his life on the Welsh mission was one of courage and boundless generosity in face of almost incredible hardships.

Born at Caernarvon, North Wales, in 1833, Henry Hughes was the son of an Anglican clergyman. Of his early days there is but scant information. His father died when Henry was quite young, and the boy with his brothers was placed under the care of a Calvinistic Methodist minister. Later, he entered an Anglican college, and it was during his student days that he became attracted to the Catholic Faith. In 1850 he was received into the Church, and shortly afterwards proceeded to Lisbon to begin his studies for the priesthood. His relatives and friends, when they heard the news, looked at one another in silent horror, but in justice to their memory it must be added that they made no attempt to deter him from his project.

Ordained priest, Fr. Hughes quickly earned a reputation as a preacher in Spain, Italy, and Portugal. He was a first-rate linguist. It is said on good authority that he spoke nine languages with ease. Moreover, his magnetic personality, his brilliant intellect, and, above all, his transparent sincerity, won the hearts of the people who thronged the churches. It would seem, though there is no definite proof, that for some time he was a professor in various small seminaries on the Continent. Certain it is that his superiors held him in high esteem, so much so that he was eventually appointed as Prefect-Apostolic of a mission territory in Africa. The missionary proved worthy of the trust that had been placed in him. He threw himself heart and soul into his work. Teaching, instructing, writing, catechizing, journeying for miles to some distant outpost—Fr. Hughes never spared himself. The natives loved him. They knew that this eager, self-sacrificing priest lived only for them.

The years passed. The strain of his missionary labours began to tax the strength of the young Prefect-Apostolic, and, on the advice of the higher superiors, he returned to Europe. But he could not bear inactivity. He became the chaplain and spiritual director of a Portuguese community of nuns settled in Boston, U.S.A. The convent flourished, and other foundations were made, the Welsh priest always ready to lend assistance and do the hardest work.

Then, in 1885, to his intense joy he received a cordial letter from Bishop Knight of Shrewsbury, inviting him to undertake apostolic work in Wales. Fr. Hughes eagerly accepted the invitation. Even in his most crowded years on the mission field, when innumerable duties had claimed his attention, Wales had never been far from his thoughts. The Welsh were his own kith and kin; the people whom he understood and loved. He had often dreamed of the Welsh hills and the rivers and the dark valleys of his boyhood days. And now, at long last, he was really going home!

Wales, then as now, was a stronghold of Nonconformity. Catholics were few and far between; a priest, though not actively disliked, was

regarded with a certain amount of suspicion. He was a stranger in speech, manners, and outlook. Consequently, the Welsh folk kept at a respectful distance.

Fr. Hughes, on his arrival in the country, wasted no time. It was his intention to found a religious Community of men under the Rule of the Third Order of St. Dominic, so that by prayer, mortification, and good works they would help to win converts to the Faith. With the approval of Bishop Knight he acquired the tiny, uninhabited island of St. Tudwal, off the Caernarvonshire coast, and there, after some initial difficulties, the heroic priest with a few lay companions established a monastery. Their life on the island resembled that of the ancient monks. These pioneers did not just dress up and play at monasticism. Far from it. The Rule was observed with a thoroughness born of true sincerity. The day was a long and strenuous one; whilst the discomforts and the Spartan simplicity, the loneliness and general dreariness would have frightened less courageous souls. Money was scarce; the food at times insufficient; the boats were not always seaworthy. Yet, despite their privations, these men, imbued with a deep sense of vocation, were extraordinarily happy. Here, we may quote the actual text of the Letter of diocesan approbation for the new foundation:

Edmund, by the grace of God and favour of the Apostolic See, Bishop of Shrewsbury. The Reverend Father Henry Bailey Mary Hughes, missionary apostolic, has my sanction and approval for his work of restoring the monastery of St. Tudwal's Island, for the Third Order of St. Dominic, and making it a centre for missions to the Welsh of North Wales: and I pray God to bless all who may aid him in any way towards the furtherance of his holy work.

Birkenhead, 18 November, 1886.

✠ EDMUND,

Bishop of Shrewsbury.

At regular intervals Fr. Hughes would cross over to the mainland, where he invariably preached in the native tongue, visiting the more remote villages and hamlets and encouraging the Catholics there. In Pwllheli he met with a splendid reception, his oratorical gifts holding the congregation spellbound. He was "one of themselves", related by blood to several families in Caernarvonshire, and the fact that he appreciated the national ideals and aspirations of the Welsh and could enter into their daily lives and discuss bardic lore, particularly the *Mabinogion*, made him welcome everywhere. Here was a Catholic priest who was also a patriotic Welshman! Pwllheli was impressed.

"The whole religion of this country," Fr. Hughes wrote, "seems to consist in the tonic solfa. . . . I believe we shall convert Wales better by singing than by preaching." Odd though this viewpoint may appear to those unacquainted with the Welsh mentality it was based on shrewd observation and sound judgement, and the zealous missionary lost no opportunity to organize choral singing in town and village. Thus he made many friends who gradually became more disposed to hear an exposition of Catholic doctrine, albeit the desired result was not in all cases attained. The history

of Nonconformity in all its phases showed that the main reason why the Welsh country-folk had flocked to the grim little Bethels and meekly accepted Puritanism was that the religious services consisted for the most part in hymn-singing and extempore prayer. The emotional appeal swept away all hesitations and doubts. Fr. Hughes decided that he must fight Welsh Calvinism with its own weapons.

Not that he was without his difficulties. There was the inevitable outburst of resentment, engineered by prominent Nonconformists, against the *crefydd gwyn* (White Order), as the little Dominican community was locally called, and some unpleasant scenes were witnessed in the district. Protestant ministers, dismayed at the prospect of losing their congregations, thundered in their pulpits against the Church of Rome, and by the utterance of wild and lurid statements endeavoured to strike terror in the hearts of their more unsophisticated hearers. Aged and half-demented spinsters, clutching their Bibles, rushed along the roads shrieking "No Popery" at the tops of their voices, their antics causing no little amusement to the onlookers. But the opposition died down as quickly as it had flared up, and at length the brethren were left in peace in their island home. In October 1887 Fr. Hughes wrote: "I went ashore yesterday to preach at Mynytho" (corruption of Mynydd y man nythod, "the mountain of little nests") "where I had to go and visit my sick convert, old David Hughes. One of his sons is coming to the island to be instructed and baptized. There is another small village close by, called Y Wyls, where the people have expressed a desire to hear me, and whither I am going, please God, next Sunday; and another young man has applied for instruction, and expressed his wish to come and learn with us on the island, that he may also become a missionary for Wales. He is pure Welsh, from this neighbourhood. . . . We have had many a hearty laugh over our pioneer difficulties; by and by, when all are over, we shall be able to laugh more. We are rather a merry lot on the island, God be praised! and not much given to grumbling, so that little involuntary mortifications help us to make up for our shortcomings in other respects. A good many kind persons, many of them entirely unknown to us, seem inclined to help us. God bless them and help them in their needs!"

When, as not infrequently happened, the attendances at the mission services were poor, Fr. Hughes, though deeply sensitive, did not give way to despair. His wide experience in other countries and his knowledge of human nature had taught him the need of patience, tact, and unflagging energy. He would say, "I have made up my mind to go to them as they will not come to me. . . ." And he would go out in search of the sheep that were lost, braving insults, scorning hardships, heedless of his own comfort, not content till he had gathered these poor, erring ones into the safety and security of the Fold. Whatever his disappointments—and they were not a few—he hid them behind a bright smile.

This heroic priest had small patience with those whose interest in the Conversion of Wales was evidenced only by pious platitudes and noisy

rhetoric. He preferred action. Nor could he understand the lack of sympathy which he met from certain influential Catholics who, without a doubt, were among his sternest critics. Their aloofness, their cautious manner, irritated and grieved him. He felt that these people, some of them in eminent positions, were sublimely indifferent to the problems and anxieties which hourly confronted him, and that their apathy constituted a stumbling-block to others. It must, however, be admitted that Fr. Hughes, particularly at the beginning of his Welsh apostolate, was a man of rather violent prejudices. For some obscure reason he was extremely biassed against the Irish secular clergy then labouring in Wales, and his attitude towards them on occasion was, to put it mildly, somewhat intransigent. And this despite the fact that the only other priest member of the monastic community, a devoted and self-sacrificing helper, hailed from Ireland. Fr. Hughes had a curious insularity of outlook which wrecked many a promising scheme, a passionate conviction that in all his opinions regarding the future of Catholicism in Wales he was invariably right—and perhaps at times he was slow to give honour where honour was due. Unfortunately, he failed to realize that his antipathies in some measure hindered his apostolic work, and estranged many excellent, well-meaning people. Yet, be it added, none could question the man's utter sincerity, his wholehearted devotion to the cause which he had espoused, and for which he had endured much suffering.

A keen student of the history and the language of Wales, Fr. Hughes firmly maintained that the Church would make no real progress in that country unless there was a trained body of Welsh-speaking priests who at least would be linguistically equipped to make the right contacts. None knew better than he from his researches that the old Faith had died hard in the principality; for even as late as the eighteenth century Protestant divines were complaining bitterly of the survival of Catholic prayers in the vernacular in the rural districts. The Welsh folk had lost the Faith on account of the scarcity of priests to minister to them in the dark days of the Elizabethan persecutions; but they had clung stubbornly to their language. In the home and in the Nonconformist chapel it was still jealously guarded, the one remaining link with such national figures as Owen Glyndwr, Dafydd ap Gwilym, Sion Cent, and a host of other stalwarts whose names and deeds are immortal. And the man who was ignorant of their ancient tongue, which they proudly regarded as their dearest heritage, would never find his way to their hearts. He was an alien, a foreigner in their midst. This important truth Fr. Hughes endeavoured to impress in season and out of season upon all those who, in one way or another, were connected with the Welsh mission. Sometimes he obtained a good hearing, more frequently he did not.

Towards the middle of November 1887 his health began rapidly to decline, and a few weeks later he took to his bed. He was worn out by his ceaseless labours and the austerity of his life. For many years he had eschewed all comforts as unworthy of the missionary vocation, and when he

had been destitute even of frugal necessities—not of seldom occurrence—he had accepted his misfortune with quiet fortitude. During his last illness no complaint ever escaped his lips, and he spent the greater part of the time in prayer, his eyes closed and his hands joined together, whilst he was often heard to exclaim: “Lord, I offer my blood and pains for the Church and poor Wales, that the true Faith may be restored to her.” To the end he was the apostle.

After his death, which took place on 16 December, the monastic community was disbanded—the leader was gone and there was no one in his stead—the brothers returned to their respective homes, and once again St. Tudwal’s remained uninhabited. Fr. Hughes’s work was done, though to all outward seeming it had ended in comparative failure. And he was not the only one who was sorely disappointed. Nevertheless, it had been a brave venture, a grand attempt to translate ideals into action, for this selfless convert and priest had counted no cost too great in the task of bringing back the old religion, *yr hen grefydd*, to his fellow-countrymen. In one thing at least he succeeded: he removed much bigotry and misunderstanding from the minds of the Welsh Protestants with whom he came in contact, inducing in them a healthy respect for the teaching and traditions of the Catholic Church. And this, in view of the times and the circumstances, was no mean achievement.

OSWALD J. MURPHY.

NOTES ON RECENT WORK

HOLY SCRIPTURE

THERE is a phrase in Hurter’s *Nomenclator*, apropos of Passaglia’s enormous work on the Immaculate Conception, which has some application to a recent book on Holy Scripture. Passaglia’s book, while extremely erudite, is said to be “suâ mole lectorem opprimens”, a judgement that would not have disturbed Mr. Belloc’s dons who were regularly seen: “Bearing from College to their homes, Deep cargoes of gigantic tomes”. Since, however, the recent volume is a reference book and not designed for continuous reading, it is certainly none the worse for being large and bulky, so that, if the kitchen scales are for once to be trusted, it has a net weight of 4 lb. 10 oz. It is the new *Concordance to the Bible (Douay Version)* by Rev. Newton Thompson and Raymond Stock,¹ and for all of us who have struggled on for years with non-Catholic concordances to versions not our own, it is more than ordinarily welcome. This is not the place to enter into a detailed history of concordance making. The relevant facts about the first English “concordancer” have been agreeably told by Miss Edith Olivier

¹ London, Herder, 1942. Pp. 1255. £2 5s. A concordance to the Douay New Testament was published some years ago.

in her book *The Eccentric Life of Alexander Cruden*;¹ it is a melancholy reflection that, whereas the first British lexicographer was merely eccentric, the first British concordance maker was indisputably mad. Among Cruden's successors perhaps the best-known and most serviceable is Robert Young's *Analytical Concordance to the Bible*, first published fifty years ago, and now in its fourteenth impression of the seventh edition. Young sets a high standard for those who come after him, and it is by comparison with Young that the new concordance to the Douay Version must, in part, be judged.

To form some idea of the method followed by the compilers a chapter chosen at random (actually the first chapter of the book of Esther) was examined with due regard for the statement in the preface that: "To reduce the bulkiness of the volume and to avoid the use of excessively fine print, some keywords, recurring hundreds of times, have been omitted." In the light of this warning it is not surprising that in v. 1 "days" is not found at all in the concordance except in the form with the apostrophe (singular and plural). "Reigned" has nearly two columns of references, but none for Esth. i, 1. The number of provinces (127) is mentioned under the noun "provinces" but not among the numeral references at the end of the work; the only reference to 127 is Gen. xxiii 1. "Sat" in v. 2 has no Old Testament occurrences catalogued, but has a column or so of New Testament references. "Throne" is entered under Esth. i, 2, but "kingdom", with one exception (Wisd. x, 10), has only New Testament occurrences noted. "Capital", which appears to be a *hapax legomenon* in DV, is duly noted. In v. 3 "princes" has several columns, including an entry for this passage, but "servants" has only New Testament references. Nearly all the remaining words of any significance are found except "most mighty" which, though it has a special heading for the superlative form, does not include the reference to Esth. i, 3. These few examples may be sufficient for a judgement on the inclusiveness of the new reference book. It may be said that, while it includes a large number of words and furnishes a generous number of references, it omits quite a quantity of common words, and, as regards others, does not always give the references to both Old and New Testament occurrences. It is a great help to finding any particular passage, provided that passage has one or more fairly distinctive words in it, but it is not a safe guide for estimating the total occurrences of a word in the Bible as a whole. In one particular it is notably inferior to Young, namely it does not give any assistance to non-Hebraists or non-Grecians regarding the word used in the original, and the precise sense in which that word is used, nor is there any guide to disputed or doubtful readings. Again, Young, while providing many more references, manages by the use of India paper to be about one and a half pounds lighter than the new Catholic concordance.

*The Bible of the World*² is another large book which in nearly fifteen hundred pages of print gives a remarkable selection from the sacred books of eight of the great religions, i.e. Christianity, Judaism, Hinduism, Buddhism, Mohammedanism, Zoroastrianism, Confucianism, and Taoism. The general idea was an excellent one; the more special purpose, as revealed in the introduction, appears to be that enunciated some years ago by a Moham-

¹ CLERGY REVIEW, Vol. VIII, p. 152.

² Edited by Robert O. Ballou. London, Kegan Paul, 1940. Pp. xxi + 1415. £1 1s.

medan speaker at an Orientalist congress: "I believe that the East cannot understand itself until it sits humbly at the feet of the West, just as I believe that the West will find its own interpretation of life incomplete until it also sits at the feet of the wise men of the East." A good deal of help is provided for those who wish to know something of the religions in question, and there are notes on many of the passages selected. Some of these notes are slightly naïve. So we are told that for centuries the Church taught that the Canticle of Canticles was an expression of Christ's love for His church, "in spite of the fact that it was written some four centuries before the birth of Jesus" (p. 1372). Apropos of the Old Testament deuterocanonical books it is stated that in 1827 the British and Foreign Bible Society took the decision to exclude these books from all its printed Bibles. "These books are, however, still retained in the Vulgate Bible used by the Roman Catholic Church" (p. 1373). The "however" is delightful, seeming to point to great temerity on the Church's part in venturing to retain the books in spite of the Bible Society's uncompromising attitude.

Without an encyclopaedic knowledge of all the translations available it is difficult to decide whether, in every case, the best rendering has been chosen, whether, for example, Rodwell's version (1876) of the Koran, from which all the selections have been made, is really so superior to later versions as to make any variety in the choice of renderings unnecessary. There can, however, be little doubt that, in the case of the apocryphal New Testament, the editors were wise in taking their selections from the excellent volume by the late Dr. M. R. James. On the other hand, it would be easy to find a better rendering of the Old Testament deuterocanonical books than that made by Roby in 1843, and it is astonishing that in a would-be representative collection there are no extracts from Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, or the Books of Machabees. The translation followed in the case of the protocanonical books is invariably the Authorised Version of 1611, whereas that interesting experiment entitled *The Bible designed to be read as literature*¹ made exceptions in the case of Job, Ecclesiastes, Proverbs and the Canticle, "where the Revised Version is admittedly far superior". A curious, but not indefensible, omission is that of any books of the Old Testament pseudepigrapha; it might be argued that difficulties of copyright would exclude the use of Charles's edition of 1913, and that it would not be a simple matter to provide alternative renderings of acknowledged excellence.² In effect, this handsome and beautifully printed book ought to be regarded as an anthology rather than as a collection of all that is best in religious literature. To those who wish to take a sample of the treasures in this book it may be recommended to consult the list in the footnote to p. xi of the introduction, which, after referring to a number of passages covering a wide field, ends with the rather quaint advice: "If you are interested in Christian Science, read *Sankara-charya's Atma Bodha*, p. 141. And if you like dogs, read 'Of the Dog', pp. 601 ff., and 'The Independence of the Dog', p. 637".

The work with the somewhat lengthy title of the *Handbook to the Cam-*

¹ Edited and arranged by E. S. Bates. London, Heinemann, 1938.

² This remains one of the problems for any future editor of a really cheap edition of these books. Such an edition is badly needed at a price not exceeding half a guinea, but the recruiting of an adequate staff of translators and the provision of a generous subsidy have so far proved obstacles hard to surmount.

*bridgeshire Syllabus of Religious Teaching*¹ (Senior Section), edited by Dr B. A. Yeaxlee, is well arranged and carefully compiled; it is also sufficiently cheap to be within the means of the teachers for whom it is intended. It is a work designed to conform to the ruling of the Education Act, 1921,² which declares that in provided schools "no religious catechism and no religious formulary distinctive of any particular denomination" may be taught. In other words, this handbook is an example of undenominational religious teaching, following the syllabus drawn up by the Cambridge Education Committee on these lines. The manual is arranged on a plan of four years of Scripture study. The first year (11+) covers briefly St. Mark and Acts i-iv together with the History of Israel from the patriarchal age to the exile. The second year (12+) has as its main theme the universal Gospel, and includes Israel's history from the exile to Herod, the universal Gospel in Christ, and the Gospel in the early Church. The third and fourth years have as their common topic the People of God. For the third year (13+) this means a study of the old Covenant, the new Covenant, and the Church in the world; for the fourth year (14+) the subjects are the apostolic preaching, developments in the early Church, and the spread of the Gospel throughout the world. (The last two items, by the way, are very briefly studied.)

This is a book that recalls, in some of its features, Professor N. H. Baynes's remarkable, and on the whole conservative, study entitled *Israel amongst the Nations: an Outline of Old Testament History*, published, from the same press as the present volume, in 1927. Here, however, the explanatory matter is fuller and the bibliographies much less copious.³ The standpoint is that of fairly moderate criticism. Like Professor Baynes the present editor holds that the patriarchs were actual historical figures (p. 77). A great part, at least, of the history of Moses is considered to be historical, though such an event as the vision of the burning bush "may perhaps be explained on the basis of rare but not unique light effects" (p. 81). Again, after a few notes on what can only be styled the aberrations of criticism, it is confidently stated that: "Fearless and accurate study have convinced most competent scholars that the Gospels are substantially accurate" (p. 264). As might be expected the treatment is often compressed, and it is not altogether easy to imagine what a teacher with little previous knowledge would make of some of the chapters, unless he were reading them under skilled guidance. It is also something of a puzzle to discover what exactly is meant by undenominational teaching. For example the Catholic and Protestant interpretations of Matt. xvi, 18 ff. are briefly summarized on pp. 174-5 (in the former case with a quotation from Cardinal Gasparri's Catechism, the only mention of a Catholic work to be found in this manual); on pp. 59-60 a specific interpretation of the Eucharist is offered, not merely a bare statement or summary

¹ London, Student Christian Movement Press, 1941. Pp. 288. Price 4s. 6d.

² Section 28, subsection 2, embodying the Cowper-Temple clause of 1870.

³ Professor Baynes's bibliographies were, in fact, the wonder and admiration of those who had some claim to be specialists in Scripture. So Professor Stanley Cook, commenting on Baynes's modest remark that the books mentioned were "only a selection from the reading of one who is no specialist in the history of Israel", writes: "If I occasionally miss a few references to English literature, I find much that had escaped my attention." See Cook's fifteen-page review in *Journal of Theological Studies*, xxix, pp. 166 ff.

of the biblical data. To conclude, this book is clearly not a work that could be handed to our own teachers as a reliable guide to traditional teaching on the scriptural part of the religious syllabus for Catholic schools. It is, however, an able and conscientious index to much of the literature used by Protestant teachers, one of whom has noted that he has found it "exceedingly helpful, and most valuable in filling in gaps and chinks just where we had fancied ourselves tolerably well versed".

JOHN M. T. BARTON.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

BAPTISMAL REGISTRATION

In the case of legal adoption of a child, when the adopting parents are most anxious that the child should not discover (at its confirmation or wedding, for instance) from its baptismal certificate that it is an adopted child, would the priest who holds the baptismal register be justified in cancelling the original entry and substituting the names of the adopting parents for the real parents or parent? Alternatively, would he be justified in annotating the original entry with a reference to a substitute entry containing the names of the adopting parents, and in giving a copy of the substitute entry, when asked, for required purposes? The civil authorities issue a fresh birth certificate when so requested by the adopting parents, on which their names appear as the real parents, and unless the Church is able to do something similar the kindly intentions of the adopting parents will be frustrated. If nothing is allowed on existing local legislation would fresh legislation be possible within the framework of the Code of Canon Law?

When the parish priest of a baptized infant knows, only in ordinary confidence, that a child is not the child of its apparent father but of another man, and that the apparent father was moved to marry its mother out of compassion for her, and that he expressly wishes the child to pass as his own and bear his name, is the priest entitled to enter the apparent father in the registers as the child's real father? (G.)

REPLY

Canon 470, §1: Habeat parochus libros paroeciales, idest librum baptizatorum . . . et omnes hos libros, secundum usum ab Ecclesia probatum vel a proprio Ordinario praescriptum, conscribat ac diligenter asservet.

Canon 777, §1: Parochi debent nomina baptizatorum, mentione facta de ministro, parentibus ac patrinis . . . in baptismali libro . . . referre.

§2: Ubi vero de illegitimis filiis agatur, matris nomen est inserendum, si publice eius maternitas constet, vel ipsa sponte sua scripto vel coram duobus testibus id petat; item nomen patris, dummodo ipse sponte sua a parocho vel scripto vel coram duobus testibus id requirat, vel ex publico

authentico documento sit notus; in ceteris casibus inscribatur natus tanquam filius patris ignoti vel ignotorum parentum.

(i) Though the question raised is a difficult problem, and one which is not adequately examined by the writers we have consulted, the correct procedure can be determined if it is remembered that a parish priest making entries in his register is merely acting as a public notary, and in no sense as a judge of what is fitting or expedient. Cf *Jus Pontificium*, 1939, XIX, p. 5. The same observation applies to the certified copies which he makes from the register. It would therefore be a grossly improper procedure for him to cancel any record therein, or to provide an extract which is not in every particular identical with the original. His duty is to inscribe the details as required by the law in canon 777, and to make only those additions or annotations required by other laws or by the Ordinary's directions: thus, from canon 1103, §2, marriage particulars are to be entered in the baptismal register. It is similarly his duty, when providing an extract from the register, to give a faithful copy of the document as it stands. An illegitimate child, for example, registered as such, may have become legitimate by the subsequent marriage of the parents, but the parish priest may not of his own authority alter the original record; he may, however, acting under instructions from the Ordinary, record in a marginal addition the fact of legitimacy from subsequent marriage.

Answering a question on the subject in this journal, 1931, I, p. 115, the late Mgr. Cronin suggested various formulae which might be used, subject to the approval of the local Ordinary, in registering the baptisms of adopted children. Cases of adoption are rather unusual, and when one occurs the parish priest should either make the entry as directed by canon 777 or refer it to the diocesan curia.

The kindly intention of the adopting parents is certainly a weighty consideration, though it is scarcely possible, one would think, to ensure that the adopted child shall be permanently ignorant of its own identity. There are equally weighty reasons, e.g. the impediment of consanguinity or the inheritance of property, why its identity should not be obscured. In the case of a child, registered as in canon 777, §2, and afterwards adopted, the Ordinary might see fit to have the record removed from the parish register and transferred to the curial archives, on analogy with the arrangement for marriages of conscience in canon 1107; the true record would remain, but a copy would not be issued except after special investigation; moreover, the fact of baptism can be established, for the purpose of confirmation or marriage, without an official extract from the register, as noted in this journal, 1938, XV, p. 261. In all cases of baptism after adoption, provided the child is illegitimate and of unknown parents, the parochial clergy could be instructed to send the particulars for entry into the curial archive. But we think it unlikely that any ecclesiastical law or regulation would ever sanction, without any qualification, an official record that a child by adoption is the real child of the persons named, except when the parents themselves make this false statement.

(ii) Paternity is one of the most difficult things to prove even in a court of law. The parish priest inscribing the baptismal register, as already stated, is not a judge but a notary. He should disregard knowledge obtained privately in confidence and accept the man's statement for entry into the

register, unless there is an authentic public proof, as mentioned in canon 777, §2, that the father is someone else. In this case, the testimony of the apparent father "sponte sua" and the testimony "ex publico authentico documento" being in conflict, the proper course is to seek the Ordinary's judgement. This is the solution of a similar case given by Vermeersch in *Periodica*, 1930, XIX, p. 167, a solution based on such canons as 1031, 1032, 1034 which direct a reference to the Ordinary for the solution of analogous doubts in other matters.

FREEDOM TO MARRY

A Catholic contracts a civil marriage and is afterwards civilly divorced. Are any special formalities necessary in this case before he may lawfully contract a fresh marriage? (E.)

REPLY

Canon 1069, §2: Quamvis prius matrimonium sit irritum aut solum qualibet ex causa, non ideo licet aliud contrahere, antequam de prioris nullitate aut solutione legitime et certo constiterit.

Instr. S. C. de *Disciplina Sacramentorum*, 15 August, 1936, Art. 231, §1: Si quis certo tenebatur ad canonicam formam celebrationis matrimonii, et tantum civile matrimonium contraxit, vel coram ministro acatholico matrimonium inivit, aut si apostatae a fide catholica in apostasia civiliter vel ritu alieno se iunxerunt, ad hoc ut constet de horum statu libero, neque iudiciales sollemnitates requiruntur, neque interventus defensoris vinculi: sed hi casus solvendi sunt ab Ordinario ipso, vel a parochio, consulto Ordinario, in praevia investigatione ad matrimonii celebrationem, de qua in can. 1019 sqq.

Instr. S. C. de *Disciplina Sacramentorum*, 29 June, 1941, n. 6, a: Praescriptum can. 1069, §2, optime norint, matrimonii nempe nullitatem *canonica probatione esse evincendam* . . . expletis regulis traditis in supra memorata Instructione huius S.C. diei 15 augusti 1936, art. 226 seq.

It is clear from the above texts that persons of this kind—loosely styled *Ne Temere* cases—are not free to contract marriage *coram ecclesia* unless the invalidity of the attempted marriage is certain, and the certainty has been lawfully established. Usually its invalidity is quite certain, but as we noted in this REVIEW, 1939, XVII, p. 453: "no matter how certain the invalidity may be, a parish priest may never assist at the marriage of a person in these circumstances without first having recourse to the Ordinary". The law has become, indeed, progressively liberal in reducing to the minimum the previous formalities to be observed in these cases, but the intervention of the Ordinary is still required, firstly, to ensure that there will be no avoidable conflict with the civil law, and for this purpose documentary proof of the civil divorce must be produced, as the Instruction, 15 August, 1941, notes in n. 6 of *Allegatum I*. It is required, secondly, for the purpose of legally establishing the invalidity of the civil contract, no matter how certain this invalidity may appear to be; it may transpire, on examination, that the person was not baptized, or that he was exempt from the obligation of observing the canonical form at the time of the civil contract, as provided

for in canon 1099, §2; in both cases the civil marriage, other things being equal, is canonically valid. The law, accordingly, directs that the Ordinary must be consulted, and a parish priest may not himself, of his own authority, decide that a person in these circumstances is free to marry.

CATHEDRATICUM

What is the legality in England at the present time of the Cathedratium, bearing in mind that the Code, and *S.C. Concilii*, 13 and 14 March, 1920, define it more restrictively than the Westminster Synods? (A. B.)

REPLY

Canon 1504: Omnes ecclesiae vel beneficia iurisdictioni Episcopi subiecta, itemque laicorum confraternitates, debent quotannis in signum, subiectionis solvere Episcopo cathedratium seu moderatam taxam ad normam can. 1507, §1, nisi iam antiqua consuetudine fuerit determinata.

Conc. Prov. Westm., III, Dec. xvii: . . . decernimus aequalem debere in posterum esse solutionem cathedratici in omnibus Dioecesibus et constare medietate librae sterlingae . . . sequentes viros Ecclesiasticos decernimus ad illud solvendum teneri:

- (1) Singula Capitula ex communi massa.
- (2) Presbyteri titulo Missionis ordinati, qui stipendia ab aliqua Ecclesia vel Oratorio recipiunt.
- (3) Qui curam gerunt animarum.
- (4) Qui praesunt Ecclesiis vel Oratoriis publicis, nisi specialem exemptionem probare valeant.

Cf. *S.C. Concilii*, 13 and 14 March, 1920 (*A.A.S.*, 1920, xii, p. 444). This resolution of the Sacred Congregation, summarized by Ayrinhac, Bouscaren and others, discussed the legality of introducing into French dioceses a tax proportioned to the numbers of parishioners in each parish. The resolution was "Prout exponitur, non expedire", and the reason given was that the proposed tax was not the cathedratium as defined in canon 1504, a uniform amount from the entities mentioned therein paid as a sign of subjection, but a tax imposed for the support of the episcopal curia.

(i) On *extrinsic* grounds we cannot perceive any good reason for supposing that the legislation of the Westminster Synod is out of harmony with that of the Code. The amount to be paid is determined by provincial law, as required by canon 1504, and the Holy See has decided that the conciliar legislation of the old Province applies, in principle, to the new English Provinces. The details of the pre-Code law have been promulgated afresh since the Code in certain English diocesan synods, which have presumably been approved by the Holy See. In France, on the contrary, the proposed tax was a novelty to which the clergy were not accustomed, and the Sacred Congregation was of the opinion that the curial expenses should be met from the fund known as "Denier du Culte". We in this country are accustomed to the cathedratium and it is very unlikely that any established tax or means of revenue would be disturbed by the Holy See.

(ii) Examined *intrinsically*, the amount fixed by the Westminster Synod,

ten shillings, is exactly that which the 1920 Resolution mentions as lawful: "Antiquitus in duobus solidis aureis constituta, in Conc. Rom. a. 1725, xx julios excedere (circ. 10 francos) prohibeatur, salvis consuetudinibus favorabilioribus iam inolitis". It was amongst the objections to the newly proposed French tax that this sum would often be exceeded.

As regards the persons or entities enumerated in the Westminster Synod, nn. 1, 3 and 4 clearly correspond to those enumerated in canon 1504; n. 3 being taken as equivalent to parish priests. Under n. 2 are included assistant priests (curates, vicarii co-operators), convent chaplains and the like, and it is probably on this title that our correspondent detects some divergency between the Synod and the Code. For it would appear that a church with four assistant priests is being taxed in proportion to the number of clergy serving it, a method which is deprecated by the Holy See in the Resolution of 1920. To this criticism it may be answered, firstly, that the word "beneficia" in canon 1504 is not restricted to parochial benefices, nor to those which are styled "perpetual", as the Resolution of 1920 notes. "Manual" benefices are included, and it is canonically possible, in certain cases, to regard an assistant priest as enjoying a benefice. Cf. canon 1412.1 and Pistocchi *De Beneficiis*, p. 32. As attentive readers of this REVIEW are aware, it is extremely hazardous to decide, at the moment, what is and what is not a benefice in this country. It may be answered, secondly, that the Resolution of 1920 was given for local reasons and conditions existing in France, and does not necessarily extend to other places. Examples may be cited of the Holy See justifying a tax, not contained within the terms of canon 1504, as being *ad instar cathedralici*. Cf. Beste, *Introductio in Codicem*, p. 728. Everyone is rightly loth to pay more in taxation, whether civil or ecclesiastical, than he is strictly and legally bound to do, but we are of the opinion, taking the whole subject by and large, that the clergy are favourably treated in this country and that the bishops rather generously refrain from making demands which they are entitled to do from such canons as 1355, 1356, 1505, 1506.

EXPECTANT MOTHERS

May a priest take Holy Communion to an expectant mother shortly before the child is expected, if she finds it difficult or inconvenient to come to the church? May he also give the blessing in the Ritual which is subtitled "in periculis partus" to all expectant mothers even though no special danger is anticipated? (A. B.)

REPLY

(i) Holy Communion may be taken to expectant mothers as to any other person in a condition of sickness or infirmity. Apart from the danger of death, the obligation of doing so cannot easily be determined; both the canons and the ritual assume that there is an obligation to communicate the sick in their homes, but its existence in an individual case must be determined by the circumstances of distance, the number of sick people in the parish, and the time at the priest's disposal; in other words, by deciding whether a

request for the sacraments is reasonable. Cf. CLERGY REVIEW, 1934, VII, p. 433; 1938, XIV, p. 164. In view of all we do, or ought to do, to encourage motherhood, it is obviously desirable to communicate expectant mothers who are unable to come to the church. Indults, moreover, are easily obtainable permitting expectant mothers to communicate non-fasting in accordance with the conditions of canon 858, §2, a practice which supports the view that they are equivalent to sick persons.

(ii) Neither the terms of the rite in the Roman Ritual, *Appendix*, n. 43, nor the interpretation of any writer known to us, require a special danger. Child-birth is always accompanied by some danger. Cf. *L'Ami du Clergé*, 1930, XLVII, p. III.

E. J. M.

BOOK REVIEWS

Broadcast Talks. By C. S. Lewis. Pp. 72. (Geoffrey Bles: The Centenary Press. 2s. 6d. net.)

THE author of *The Screwtape Letters*—for by this title Mr. Lewis must continue to be known until he has achieved the difficult task of surpassing that masterpiece of practical spirituality—has given us a further taste of his quality in this reprint of his *Broadcast Talks: Right and Wrong: A Clue to the Meaning of the Universe* and *What Christians Believe*; a reprint welcome equally to those who, like the reviewer, did not hear the talks when delivered and to the many others who, having heard them, will be glad to possess them thus permanently recorded. Whether his subject be philosophy, as it is in the first of these two series, or theology, as it is in the second, the author shows himself a master in the rare art of conveying profound truths in simple and compelling language.

In concluding from the consideration of an objective Moral Law that there is a God, or at any rate a Mind behind the universe, Mr. Lewis is using an argument which is familiar to Catholic apologists, though few of them perhaps have succeeded in developing it with his clearness and appeal. In particular we recommend the first and second Talks in this first series, where the objective character of the Law of Human Behaviour is vindicated with arguments which are in our opinion quite unanswerable. No less commendable from every point of view is the fifth and last, in which Mr. Lewis points out with unflinching logic the practical implications of the admission that "there is a real Moral Law, and a Power behind the law, and that you have broken that law and put yourself wrong with that Power" (p. 32).

If we are tempted to make some reservations in our praise of Talks III and IV it is not because of any failure in them to sustain the high level of lucidity and interest maintained throughout this little volume; indeed the philosophically minded will perhaps find these the most interesting in the book. It is rather because here the author's reasoning is unlikely to be followed by all his readers: accepting his major premise and welcoming his conclusion, not a few will falter in the path by which he passes from

the first to the second: "This Rule of Right and Wrong . . . must somehow or other be a real thing—a thing that's really there, not made up by ourselves. And yet it's not a fact in the ordinary sense, in the same way as our actual behaviour is a fact. It begins to look as if we'll have to admit that there's more than one kind of reality; that, in this particular case, there's something above and beyond the ordinary facts of men's behaviour, and yet quite definitely real—a real law, which none of us made, but which we find pressing on us" (p. 23). That the Moral Law is objective and immutable we do not doubt; but it would not be easy, unless with Plato we admit the real existence of Universals, to maintain that the Moral Law is real. The facts to which Mr. Lewis alludes seem to be sufficiently explained if we regard the Rule of Right and Wrong as a set of abstract principles of human conduct based upon human nature considered precisely as *nature*. The study of man, a contingent being, compounded of body and soul, and living in natural fellowship with members of his kind, reveals certain actions as conformable with such a nature and certain other actions as discordant with it; and the formulation of these modes of behaviour in the shape of universal propositions (e.g. "Stealing is wrong") would result in what we call the Moral Law. Surely it would be abstract, this law, not real. Abstract, yet truly objective and unchangeable; objective because grounded in that human nature which is really embodied in every member of humanity; unchangeable because, whatever particular men may do, the nature of man can never change. Because man is free he can behave like a beast if he wants to, but abstract human nature remains constantly before his mind to tell him how unworthily he embodies it. If the objectivity of the Moral Law is thus satisfactorily explained, then we are still far from having proved the existence of a Mind behind the universe—unless of course we invoke the "contingency" of man, or allow our reasoning to lead us along another of the famous Five Ways. And indeed we feel that Mr. Lewis is on much firmer ground when, in the first Talk of his second series, he proves the existence of God from "design", a design which is no less evident in the movement of electrons than in the spiritual activity of man himself.

In attempting—in his second series of talks—a statement of *What Christians Believe* such as all denominations might in some sense accept, Mr. Lewis was entering upon a very difficult undertaking. That he has in fact succeeded to a great extent in giving a formulation of the fundamental Christian doctrines of the Incarnation and the Redemption which even Catholics could in some sense adopt as a statement of their belief, is a tribute—if Mr. Lewis will pardon a typically Catholic utterance—to the deep understanding of those doctrines which he himself has achieved. Especially forthright is his profession of faith in the Incarnation: "I'm trying to prevent anyone from saying the really silly thing that people often say about Him: 'I'm ready to accept Jesus as a great moral teacher, but I don't accept his claim to be God.' That's the one thing we mustn't say. . . . You must make your choice. Either this man was, and is, the Son of God; or else a madman or something worse. You can shut Him up for a fool, you can spit at Him and kill Him as a demon; or you can fall at His feet and call Him Lord and God. But don't let us come with any patronizing nonsense about His being a great human teacher. He

hasn't left that open to us. He didn't intend to" (pp. 50-51). In his sincere desire to meet the requirements of every form of Christian teaching Mr. Lewis asked the opinion, among others, of a Catholic upon his work. The Catholic was of opinion that the author attributed too little importance to theories of the atonement, a judgement which Mr. Lewis duly records both in his Preface and in the text itself. With this opinion we are inclined to agree. Mr. Lewis rightly says (p. 52) that "the central Christian belief is that the death of Christ has somehow put us right with God. Theories as to how it did this are another matter." Truly the Redemption is a mystery: God has revealed that it is so; but how it is so we cannot understand. Yet it should perhaps be borne in mind that there are certain explanations of the "how" which have been revealed to us in the form of analogies (such as that of vicarious satisfaction) and religious conceptions (such as that of sacrifice) which it is our bounden duty to retain, and which the theologian has the right and the obligation to elaborate. On the other hand, there have been certain theories (the Pelagian, for example) which, far from explaining the Redemption, eviscerate it of any true and objective reality. These, too, have their importance inasmuch as they must be avoided. If Catholic theologians have always been at pains to "explain" the Redemption, it has only been out of solicitude lest even the smallest crumb of revealed truth should be lost.

Mr. Lewis's little book will repay careful study. His 72 pages contain a volume of truly Christian thought far in excess of their apparent capacity.

G. D. S.

The Bishop of Münster and the Nazis. The Documents in the Case. Translated and edited by Patrick Smith. With a Foreword by his Grace the Archbishop of Liverpool. Large Crown 8vo. Pp. x + 54. Paper covers. (Burns Oates & Washbourne. 2s.)

THE publishers claim for this book that it "will be one of the most important historical documents of the war"; and there is a great deal of truth in their claim. The substance of the book is the text of the three sermons preached by Bishop von Galen in two of the churches of his episcopal city in July and August of last year. Mr. Smith's work has been to situate the man and the sermons, to add some part of his correspondence with the Reich authorities, and to draw some of the obvious conclusions. The sermons themselves are magnificent and one can well understand the sensation they created at the time. They are the authentic voice of a Catholic bishop both addressing and defending his flock, with dignity, fatherly affection and high courage. They are directed at "the enemy within our gates, who tortures and strikes at us"—the Gestapo, its actions and, especially, its principles. In a most moving passage at the end of his second sermon the bishop compares his people to the anvil upon which fall the hammer-blows of hostility to the Church and to religion. Yet it is the anvil as much as the hammer which fashions the iron; and the Catholic youth of Westphalia must be fashioned, as indeed all Catholics must be, by steadfast resistance to tyranny in the name of justice and religion. This is, indeed, a most trenchant and revealing criticism of the whole Nazi system and its methods, and a noble defence of the elementary rights of human beings. It is certainly a book to have and to read.

A. B.

Music & Liturgy, October 1942. The Quarterly of the Society of St. Gregory. (1s.)

AN account given in *THE CLERGY REVIEW*, September 1942, of the National Liturgical Week held at Minnesota last year, expressed the hope that a similar liturgical conference would be held in this country when times are more propitious. It was written and printed some weeks before publication, the writer being at the time unaware of the projected Summer School at Wadham College, Oxford, from August 3rd to the 8th, arranged by the Society of St. Gregory. The proceedings were widely commented upon in the Catholic Press, and the current number of the Society's publication is devoted entirely to this excellent and very significant meeting. Everyone interested in popularizing the liturgy should read the account which, though not a complete *verbatim* report of the lectures and discussions, does give a full and substantial report of all the conferences, except that of Mr. Robert Speaight on "Liturgy and Art" which will appear in the January issue.

The plan for each day, the ordered round of worship, conference, and discussion, and the subjects chosen for study, resembled very closely the activities at Minnesota. Lectures on the relation of liturgy to the spiritual life by Dom J. B. McElligott, on its sociological aspects by Fr. Thorold, and on the laity's use of the Divine Office by members of the Magnificat Society, alternated with practical lectures on the ways and means of restoring liturgical worship to its proper place in the religious life of the faithful. Two of these are specially notable. Fr. Valentin gave a description of the way he has succeeded in stirring up liturgical enthusiasm in his small Hertfordshire parish of Stevenage, a happy result which many of his brethren may well try to emulate. Owing, no doubt, to the exigencies of space, we learn little or nothing of the discouragements and set-backs he must have experienced during these twenty-one years of valiant effort; unless this favoured spot is a kind of Hertfordshire oasis, these must have been very considerable. Mother Gertrude Winstanley, F.C.J., on the other hand, in describing the liturgical movement at Sedgley Park training college, gives us the result of a questionnaire put to a number of ex-students with a view to discovering their reactions to such practices as the Dialogue Mass and a weekly Missa Cantata. They were not all enthusiastic, to put it mildly, and a substantial minority preferred to assist at Mass without such "distractions." These objections and criticisms can easily be met, but it seems to us of the utmost value that they should have been aired and discussed at a liturgical conference in the calm academic atmosphere of Oxford.

The Quarterly is well produced—admirably so during a time of war—and can be had, together with membership of the Society of St. Gregory, for the small annual sum of 5s. E. J. M.

Retrospect of an Unimportant Life. By Herbert Hensley Henson. Volume One, 1863-1920. Demy 8vo, pp. viii + 341, with eight illustrations (Oxford University Press, 16s.)

DR. HENSON is a man of very decided views, has no hesitation in saying exactly what he means, and, in this record of his life up to his translation to Durham from Hereford in 1920, says it in a most interesting and engaging way. Since his appointment to a Canonry of Westminster in 1900 he has

appeared to the public on a variety of occasions as the "stormy petrel" of the Establishment, whether with regard to "interpretations" of the Creed, communion with non-episcopal bodies, Education Bills, or the place and powers of Bishops in the Church of England. His book does not convey adequately the extent of the outcry which was raised against his elevation to the See of Hereford in 1918, but it does give very clearly a defence of his own position and teaching, and in the process it exposes with complete frankness the doctrinal disintegration into which the Establishment has fallen, and the absurd disciplinary situation which has resulted. In 1909, in days when "pulpit swopping" was much less in vogue than at present, Canon Henson was invited by a Nonconformist minister to preach in Birmingham. Bishop Gore objected, to no purpose. Canon Henson's entry in his journal reveals both the situation and the man. After referring to correspondence with the Bishop, he notes "On Saturday morning a formal *Inhibition* reached me, and I at once wrote to the Bishop that I should ignore it." It was in reference to this that, on Henson's translation to Durham, W. P. Ker wrote:

"The mitre lights after suspension
Upon the head of Herbert Henson."

Henson's own comment on the situation is apt: "There is no doubt that the C. of E. is so incoherent and divided as really neither to think nor to act as one body."

The author's relations with Catholicism are of interest. There are many Catholics who hold that among non-Catholic clergy there must be numbers who have felt the attraction of Catholicism, have made the approach to the Church, and then, for some reason or other, have "missed the bus". Certainly Dr. Henson's story seems to bear out that contention. Thus, in May 1885: "I've played with the Catholic idea so long to spite the Low Churchpeople, that I can't resume my freedom now I want to! The idea of the Church has seized me, and I can't shake it off; and yet I worship intellectual freedom; and I suspect (the suspicion ever gains force) that, if I am to be a 'Catholic' I must say good-bye to my intellectual freedom." And again, a year later: "Shall I never be free? How I do long to throw aside all this life, and to be sincere and a follower of Jesus Christ! . . . This gay, sightseeing society elbows me out of the holy place. Sometimes it seems to me that the end of it all will be Romanism. . . . Yet why? Assuredly not because I believe in Roman Catholicism, perhaps because my restlessness spurs me on to change. . . ." But ten years later, now ordained, and Chaplain to the Hospital at Ilford, there is a different, and far more bitter note. This time the issue is "the proselytizing ardour of the local Roman clergy". After one youth had come to tell him that he had been to Mass and could no longer in conscience attend an Anglican service he noted the following:

This, I suspect, is a direct counsel of Fr. ——. I was very kind to Lionel, but pointed out that he could hardly reach a just decision on the Church of England, if he surrendered himself in advance to the Church of Rome. I have little doubt that the lad will go into the Papist net and as little that he will rend his way out of it after a while. But into what species of net he will then fall, I have grave doubts. At 16, Romanism is irresistible: at 25 it is suspicious: at 30 it is impossible: and finally its shadow darkens every other version of Christianity.

Certainly it seems to have darkened Dr. Henson's view. There is little more mention of the Church in his book, but the strain of bitterness is always present. Ottawa Cathedral is "a tawdry building in the worst possible taste . . . a fit symbol of the Church whose worship it serves". Laval University receives the following comment: "Neither art nor science in Canada would be injured if the whole were destroyed by fire. Three rather coarse-looking Roman priests went round the University with us. Their childish delight at seeing the solitary mummy, which represents Egyptian studies, indicated sufficiently the narrowness of their mental range." One wonders if Dr. Henson may not be one of those who has "missed the bus".

A. B.

Hymns for Sailors, Soldiers and Airmen. Words by Egerton Clarke. Music by H. Hamilton Jefferies. (Skeffington. Words and Music, 6d. Words only, 1d.)

CHAPLAINS to the Forces may find in these three hymns just what they have been looking for—hymns suitable for use in the Forces, asking God's blessing and protection on all those who are in peril by sea, on land and in the air. The words have something of the virility of Chesterton's "O God of Earth and Altar" combined with an imaginativeness reminiscent of Francis Thompson's "Heaven and Charing Cross".

By Thee alone can men be free
And only in Thy will,
O Christ, who calmed the troubled sea,
Can peace be still:

Make us obedient to thy word
As tempest is and gale;
Walking the waters, help us, Lord,
Where'er we sail.

(For Sailors)

Although the tunes are not of outstanding merit they have the virtue of a direct straightforwardness which will enable them to be learned without difficulty, and what is more important—to be remembered.

As the appeal of these hymns is not restricted to those in the Forces, they would make a useful supplement to the parish hymn book.

H. P. T.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE ENDS OF MARRIAGE

Father X writes:

I have been a reader of THE CLERGY REVIEW since its first appearance and I feel deeply grateful to those who have made and kept it what it is. I trust therefore that it will not be taken amiss if I point out some-

thing which seems to me rather more than one of those minor blemishes which are incidental to most good work and which are rightly to be passed over in silence. I do it with all the more reluctance because what I have to find fault with has been written by Canon Mahoney, to whose competent work readers of your REVIEW owe so much, and whose fine article, "Bondmen or Free", first made me realize that THE CLERGY REVIEW was going to be something better than we had been accustomed to.

My difficulty is with what he says on page 463 of your October issue in dealing with an objection raised from the primary and secondary purposes of marriage. "It would disappear," he says, "if we are to accept the new theory of Dr. Doms and others on the meaning and purpose of marriage. . . . Assuming the traditional doctrine to be correct, as explicitly formulated in Canon 1013, §1, and in *Casti Connubii*", etc.

I have underlined the words which I find fault with. Canon Mahoney is, of course, entitled to assume that the theological opinion opposed to Dr. Doms's opinion, is correct. But I submit that he is not entitled to call this opinion "traditional doctrine" nor to state that it is "explicitly formulated in canon 1013 and in *Casti Connubii*", unless he makes it clear that these are also assumptions of his own, made for the sake of argument and not intended to be challenged. As it stands, I think his statement unfair and misleading.

I think it unfair because the European war prevents Dr. Doms from seeing and replying to statements which, if they were true, would mean that his theory was false; also because in English-speaking countries Dr. Doms's work is, unfortunately, represented by an incompetent and truncated translation of his original work, and therefore there is not much chance that these statements will be judged at their proper worth by those who read them in these countries.

I think it misleading for at least two reasons. First, because it ignores the fact that Dr. Doms has dealt fully with the claim of the theory opposed to his own, to be called "traditional doctrine". He may not have convinced Canon Mahoney, but I think he has convinced a good many others that, whatever the merits of his theory, there is nothing in the Church's tradition opposed to it. I do not want now to discuss Dr. Doms's argument on this point, but surely Canon Mahoney might have remembered that St. Alphonsus Ligouri, in dealing with the ends of marriage (*Moral Theology*, bk. 6, n. 881), barely mentions the so-called traditional division into primary and secondary ends, and bases his own account of them on a division closely corresponding to that of Dr. Doms. Is it fitting to dispose of all this in an *obiter dictum*? Secondly, because Canon Mahoney's statement ignores the fact that *Casti Connubii* contains a paragraph which qualifies canon 1013, and all papal or episcopal citations of it, in a sense which is, on the face of it, favourable to Dr. Doms's theory. Granted that Canon Mahoney is entitled to his opinion that this paragraph ought to be understood differently, I submit that he is not entitled to dispose of such a controverted point in an *obiter dictum*. Of course I do not suggest that Canon Mahoney intended to prejudice Dr. Doms's chances of a fair discussion, but I fear that this may be the effect of his words upon people who, like myself, admire Canon Mahoney's learning and are impressed—as this letter shows me to have been impressed—even by his *obiter dicta*.

Canon Mahoney replies:

If "tradition" is taken in the strict dogmatic sense used, for example, in the decrees of the Vatican Council or in Pius V's Profession of Faith, Father X rightly objects to any suggestion that the thesis of Dr. Doms is not traditional. But there is another, a commoner, and in the context of my phrasing a more obvious meaning of the word. Reviewers of Dr. Doms's fine book, whether friendly to it or not, have conveniently and correctly described the view he rejects as traditional, in the sense of what is customary, established or ancient, and it was in this sense that I used the word.

I will quote two leading Reviews, the one theological and the other canonical, to illustrate my contention:

Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses, 1938, xv, p. 541: "Pour lui, le sens du mariage n'est pas tout d'abord, ainsi que le veut Saint Thomas avec la tradition quasi unanime, d'être orienté vers l'enfant comme fin principale, mais vers l'union à deux dans la communauté conjugale."

Apollinaris, 1939, xii, p. 537: "... est quaedam oppositio, quasi reactio contra doctrinam de matrimonio communem apud canonistas et moralistas catholicos, quos auctor reprehendendos censet eo quod de matrimonii sensu sileant ac nimis extollant matrimonii finem, qui primarius dicitur et consistit in bono prolis. Hic modus traditionalis rem concipiendi provenit, iuxta A., partim ex ignorantia scientiae biologicae, partim ex irrationabili despectu sexualitatis, partim adhuc ex consideratione fere exclusiva aspectus socialis instituti matrimonialis: inde fit ut coniuges moderni a traditionali doctrina abhorreant."

Indeed, the interest aroused in theological circles by Dr. Doms's thesis is due precisely to his courageous departure from the traditional outlook. Even the author admits that it is not the ancient view, and with the admirable confidence of David confronting Goliath does not hesitate to engage St. Thomas himself. In the course of a controversy with Fr. Boigelot, S.J., *Nouvelle Revue Théologique*, May 1939, he writes on p. 526:

"Je juge donc les relations fonctionnelles des fins du mariage autrement que saint Thomas et ses vrais disciples"; and on page 537: "Il (Fr. Boigelot) n'a évidemment pas fait lui-même l'expérience, fréquente en Allemagne, que l'on arrive à peine à faire impression sur les jeunes gens par les motifs de l'ancienne et trop exclusive théorie du finis primarius, tandis qu'on y réussit quand on parle du sens personnel du mariage et de la sexualité."

The passage from *Casti Connubii*, frequently quoted by Dr. Doms and others, was omitted from the official English version of the encyclical. I was the first, I believe, to call attention in this journal, 1938, XV, p. 150, to a serious defect which has since been remedied. Far from being hostile to Dr. Doms's thesis, I may claim therefore to have contributed something in its defence, though I am not now concerned, any more than I was when penning the passage which has offended Fr. X, either with attacking or defending Dr. Doms's theory. It is attractive in many respects. I am merely justifying my use of the word "traditional" to signify the view from which Dr. Doms dissents.

I am very grateful to Fr. X for his kind remarks about my contribution to this journal in April 1931, defending a view about servile work which is not the traditional one usually found in the manuals of moral theology. Whilst somewhat marvelling at his facility in discovering so much sinister meaning in a three-line *obiter dictum*, I cannot but envy Dr. Doms in having so vigilant, so faithful and—but for his anonymity—so intrepid a disciple and champion.

BAZAARS AND COUPONS

The Board of Trade asks us to communicate the following:

ARE YOU HOLDING A BAZAAR?

DO YOU KNOW THAT:

- (1) New rationed articles always require coupons (even if made from old or secondhand material, or material for which coupons have already been surrendered).
- (2) Secondhand garments require coupons if sold above certain prices.
- (3) Organizers of Sales of Work who wish for a float of coupons may write to the Board of Trade, Raleigh House, Dolphin Square, S.W.1.
- (4) Coupons taken at a sale must be sent within 14 days of the termination by registered post to the Chief Accountant, Board of Trade, Telephone House, Bournemouth, together with a list of the goods sold against them.
- (5) Organizers will find the 1942-3 Clothing Quiz a useful guide. It costs 2d. and may be obtained through any bookseller.

HOMILETICS

AN EDITORIAL ANNOUNCEMENT

IT is proposed, with the January issue of 1943, to introduce what we hope may prove a welcome change in this familiar feature of THE CLERGY REVIEW. This section has hitherto been devoted to sermon notes, more frequently to the full text of short sermons, on the Sunday gospels or epistles; and the result is that the twenty-two volumes (covering a period of twelve years) which are complete with the present number will be found to provide an abundant source of homiletic material. We are far from suggesting that all the possibilities of the gospels and epistles have been exhausted by the able contributors who have provided us with sermons during that period. But it remains true, nevertheless, that there are many important subjects upon which the faithful need to be instructed, and which can only by a feat of unusual ingenuity and by a generous use of the *sensus accommodatitius* be associated with the scriptural texts assigned by the liturgy to each Sunday. It is to provide some assistance in meeting this need that the proposed change is designed.

We hope, therefore, in subsequent issues to publish "Aids" to sermons or instructions on chosen subjects. They will not be sermons or instructions, but *aids* to their preparation: comprising a schematic division of the

discourse, brief suggestions of the lines upon which each point might be developed, illustrations and analogies, bibliography—and any other help to composition which the experience and skill of the contributor may suggest. We have reason to believe that this method, besides economizing space which may profitably be allocated to other features, will be found more acceptable to the majority of our readers. The subjects will be chosen, not with a view to the liturgical season, but having in mind the actual importance of the topic, the needs of the faithful, and (not least) the convenience of the preacher who, whether on Sunday or week-day evenings, may sometimes find himself at a loss for a theme.

For the success of this scheme we shall rely—and the experience even of three years' war-time editorship has shown that we can rely with confidence—upon the interest and active support of our regular readers and subscribers. It is in their practical wisdom, in their first-hand knowledge of parochial conditions, in the skill which they have acquired from practice, that we hope to find a source of inspiration and help for their brethren in the priesthood; and it is from them that we hope to receive suggestions of fruitful topics as well as useful and practical outlines. To those whom modesty deters we willingly offer the shelter of anonymity.

Meanwhile, for the convenience of those readers who wish to make use of the homiletic material hitherto published in the pages of THE CLERGY REVIEW, we print hereunder a Homiletic Index, compiled by an industrious contributor. It relates almost entirely to the monthly sermon section of the REVIEW, but a few references have been given also to articles, where these are especially adapted to the preacher's use.¹

In cases where parts of the Proper of the Mass other than the Epistle or Gospel have been commented upon, the reference has been included under *Epistle*. The second part of the Index relates to Feasts and other occasions which, sometimes happening to fall on a Sunday, have suggested to the writer a subject other than the theme of the Epistle or Gospel. The first numeral in each reference indicates the volume, the second numeral the page. Thus, for the 1st Sunday of Advent, the notes on the Epistle contributed by Mgr. Ronald Knox will be found in Volume II, page 352.

HOMILETIC INDEX

(1931-1942)

I. FOR THE SUNDAYS OF THE YEAR

1ST SUNDAY OF ADVENT

Epistle: Knox, 2, 352; Dean, 6, 387; Patten, 19, 420; Coyne, 19, 482; Smith, 21, 222; Graf, 22, 460.

Gospel: Martindale, 4, 317; Patten, 8, 388; Steuart, 10, 371; Anon., 13, 373; Calnan, 15, 335; Barton, 17, 421.

¹ e.g. Archbishop Goodier, "No Room at the Inn" January, 1938.

IIND SUNDAY OF ADVENT

Epistle: Bonney, 4, 389; Dean, 6, 389; Byrne, 15, 415; Patten, 19, 421.

Gospel: Goodier, 2, 425; Bonney, 4, 390; Patten, 8, 389; Steuart, 10, 373; Anon., 13, 406; Barton, 17, 423; Finan, 21, 274; Valentine, 22, 506.

IIIRD SUNDAY OF ADVENT

Epistle: Bonney, 4, 391; Dean, 6, 391; Byrne, 15, 418; Patten, 19, 423.

Gospel: Goodier, 2, 426; Bonney, 4, 392; Patten, 8, 391; Steuart, 10, 375; Barton, 17, 426; Finan, 21, 276; Valentine, 22, 507.

IVTH SUNDAY OF ADVENT

Epistle: Bonney, 4, 393; Anon., 13, 408.

Gospel: Goodier, 2, 428; Bonney, 4, 394; Dean, 6, 393; Patten, 8, 392, and 19, 425; Steuart, 10, 377; Byrne, 15, 420; Barton, 17, 428; Finan, 21, 278; Valentine, 22, 509.

SUNDAY AFTER CHRISTMAS

Epistle: Dean, 6, 395; Patten, 19, 426.

Gospel: Goodier, 2, 430; Patten, 8, 394; Steuart, 10, 379; Barton, 17, 431; Valentine, 22, 510.

SUNDAY AFTER THE CIRCUMCISION (HOLY NAME)

Epistle: Bird, 1, 73; Geddes, 2, 528; Gonne, 10, 458; Garvin, 19, 513.

Gospel: Bird, 1, 74; Steuart, 12, 464; Anon., 13, 444; Byrne, 21, 335.

IST SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY

Epistle: Bird, 1, 74; Goodier, 8, 471.

Gospel: Bird, 1, 76; Geddes, 2, 529; Knox, 4, 483; Graf, 6, 474; Goodier, 8, 472; Gonne, 10, 461; Steuart, 12, 466; Anon., 13, 445; McReavy, 15, 515; Martindale, 17, 514; Garvin, 19, 516; Byrne, 21, 336.

IIND SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY

Epistle: Bird, 1, 77; Geddes, 2, 531; Goodier, 8, 473.

Gospel: Bird, 1, 79; Knox, 4, 485; Graf, 6, 477; Goodier, 8, 474; Gonne, 10, 463; Steuart, 12, 469; Anon., 13, 446; McReavy, 15, 518; Martindale, 17, 516; Garvin, 19, 518; Byrne, 21, 338.

IIIRD SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY

Epistle: Bird, 1, 80; Goodier, 8, 475.

Gospel: Bird, 1, 81; Knox, 4, 487; Graf, 6, 479; Goodier, 8, 476; Gonne, 10, 465; Steuart, 12, 471; Anon., 13, 448; McReavy, 15, 521; Martindale, 17, 519; Garvin, 19, 521; Byrne, 21, 340.

IVTH SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY

Epistle: (None).

Gospel: Knox, 4, 489; Graf, 6, 480; Cartmell, 8, 305; Dean, 9, 43; Martindale, 11, 35, and 17, 521; Steuart, 12, 474; McReavy, 15, 524; Calnan, 19, 323.

VTH SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY

Epistle: Martindale, 4, 310; Goodier, 5, 48.

Gospel: Knox, 2, 348; Steuart, 4, 231; Martindale, 4, 311; Goodier, 5, 49; Cartmell, 8, 306; Dean, 9, 45; Anon., 13, 369; Byrne, 17, 329; Calnan, 19, 325.

VITH SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY

Epistle: Vonier, 6, 307; Smith, 21, 219.

Gospel: Knox, 2, 350; Martindale, 4, 313; Cartmell, 8, 308; Anon., 13, 370; Byrne, 17, 331; Calnan, 19, 327; Smith, 21, 220.

SEPTUAGESIMA

Epistle: Dean, 1, 192; Goodier, 5, 50; Martindale, 11, 37; Morgan, 16, 42; Gordon, 20, 46; Cartmell, 22, 23.

Gospel: Geddes, 2, 533; Goodier, 5, 51; Graf, 6, 481; Dean, 9, 47; Martindale, 11, 37.

SEXAGESIMA

Epistle: Dean, 1, 193; Goodier, 5, 52; Boylan, 7, 43; Martindale, 11, 40; Morgan, 16, 44; Gordon, 20, 48; Cartmell, 22, 24.

Gospel: Geddes, 2, 534; Goodier, 5, 53; Dean, 9, 48; Martindale, 11, 40.

QUINQUAGESIMA

Epistle: Dean, 1, 196; Goodier, 5, 55; Boylan, 7, 46; Martindale, 11, 43; Morgan, 16, 47; Gordon, 20, 50; Cartmell, 22, 25.

Gospel: Villiers, 3, 48; Goodier, 5, 56; Boylan, 9, 133; Martindale, 11, 43; Anon., 13, 11; Prime, 18, 40.

1ST SUNDAY OF LENT

Epistle: Dean, 1, 198, and 11, 130; Boylan, 7, 48; Anon., 13, 12; Morgan, 16, 50; Cartmell, 22, 27.

Gospel: Villiers, 3, 51; Calnan, 5, 139; Boylan, 9, 135; Anon., 13, 12; Patten, 14, 140; Prime, 18, 43; Roche, 20, 139.

IIND SUNDAY OF LENT

Epistle: Bonney, 1, 281; Boylan, 7, 51; Dean, 11, 132; Anon., 13, 13; Patten, 14, 142; Roche, 20, 141.

Gospel: Bonney, 1, 282; Villiers, 3, 54; Calnan, 5, 141; Boylan, 9, 138; Anon., 13, 13; Goodier, 16, 131; Prime, 18, 46; Crawford, 21, 26; Walsh, 22, 71.

IIIRD SUNDAY OF LENT

Epistle: Bonney, 1, 283; Anon., 13, 14; Patten, 14, 144; Roche, 20, 144.

Gospel: Bonney, 1, 284; Villiers, 3, 57; Calnan, 5, 143; Steuart, 7, 138; Barton, 9, 140; Dean, 11, 134; Anon., 13, 14; Goodier, 16, 135; Prime, 18, 49; Walsh, 22, 72.

IVTH SUNDAY OF LENT

Epistle: Bonney, 1, 286; Dean, 3, 131, and 11, 137; Patten, 14, 146; Mahoney, 18, 130; Roche, 20, 146.

Gospel: Bonney, 1, 286; Calnan, 5, 145; Steuart, 7, 139; Barton, 9, 142; Anon., 13, 53; Goodier, 16, 136; Walsh, 22, 73.

PASSION SUNDAY

Epistle: Bonney, 1, 287; Dean, 3, 133, and 11, 139; Anon., 13, 54; Mahoney, 18, 132; Roche, 20, 149.

Gospel: Bonney, 1, 288; Steuart, 5, 216, and 7, 141; Vonier, 9, 222; Arendzen, 14, 229; Goodier, 16, 138; Walsh, 22, 74.

PALM SUNDAY

Epistle: Bonney, 1, 289; Mahoney, 18, 134.

Gospel: Dean, 3, 135; Steuart, 5, 217, and 7, 143; Vonier, 9, 224; Bennett, 11, 220; Anon., 13, 55; Arendzen, 14, 232; Patten, 16, 222; Graf, 20, 222; Walsh, 22, 75.

EASTER SUNDAY

Epistle: Patten, 16, 222; Graf, 20, 226.

Gospel: Lattey, 1, 404; Dean, 3, 138; Steuart, 5, 219; Calnan, 7, 227; Vonier, 9, 226; Bennet, 11, 222; Anon., 13, 57; Arendzen, 14, 235; Patten, 16, 227; Mahoney, 18, 137.

LOW SUNDAY

Epistle: Vonier, 9, 229; Anon., 13, 88; Arendzen, 14, 238; Mahoney, 18, 138; Graf, 20, 228.

Gospel: Lattey, 1, 405; Drinkwater, 3, 214; Steuart, 5, 220; Calnan, 7, 229; Bennett, 11, 224; Anon., 13, 88; Patten, 16, 225.

IIND SUNDAY AFTER EASTER

Epistle: Bennett, 11, 226; Graf, 20, 231.

Gospel: Lattey, 1, 407; Drinkwater, 3, 215; Steuart, 5, 222; Calnan, 7, 231; Graf, 9, 322; Anon., 13, 89; Knox, 18, 233.

IIIRD SUNDAY AFTER EASTER

Epistle: Delaney, 5, 301; Anon., 13, 90; Patten, 16, 229.

Gospel: Lattey, 1, 407; Drinkwater, 3, 217; Calnan, 7, 233; Graf, 9, 325; Bonnar, 11, 305; Knox, 18, 235.

IVTH SUNDAY AFTER EASTER

Epistle: Delaney, 5, 302.

Gospel: Lattey, 1, 409; Drinkwater, 3, 218; Calnan, 7, 235; Graf, 9, 328; Bonnar, 11, 307; Knox, 18, 237; Steuart, 22, 166.

VTH SUNDAY AFTER EASTER

Epistle: Morgan, 3, 314; Delaney, 5, 305.

Gospel: Lattey, 1, 410; Dean, 7, 324; Graf, 9, 330; Bonnar, 11, 308; Anon., 13, 132; Kerr, 16, 324; Knox, 18, 240.

SUNDAY AFTER THE ASCENSION

Epistle: Morgan, 3, 316.

Gospel: Lattey, 1, 411; Delaney, 5, 306; Dean, 7, 326, and 9, 422; Bonnar, 11, 310; Anon., 13, 133; Kerr, 16, 328; Cartmell, 18, 313; Steuart, 22, 168.

PENTECOST

Epistle: Morgan, 3, 317; Dean, 7, 328, and 9, 424; Cartmell, 18, 315; Knox, 20, 418; Steuart, 22, 169.

Gospel: Lattey, 1, 412; Bird, 5, 393; Bonnar, 11, 311; Anon., 13, 133; Steuart, 14, 420; Kerr, 16, 333; Knox, 20, 418.

TRINITY SUNDAY

Epistle: Morgan, 3, 319; Dean, 7, 330, and 9, 426; Knox, 20, 419.

Gospel: Lattey, 1, 413; Bird, 5, 394; Dean, 11, 388; Anon., 13, 135; Steuart, 14, 423, and 22, 170; Messenger, 16, 418-28; Cartmell, 18, 318.

IIND SUNDAY AFTER PENTECOST

Epistle: Boylan, 1, 513; Morgan, 3, 320; Roche, 7, 413.

Gospel: Boylan, 1, 514; Bird, 5, 396; Dean, 9, 428, and 11, 390; Anon., 13, 136; Steuart, 14, 425; Cartmell, 18, 321; Knox, 20, 421.

IIIRD SUNDAY AFTER PENTECOST

Epistle: Boylan, 1, 516; Bonney, 3, 394; Bird, 5, 398; Graham, 18, 419.

Gospel: Boylan, 1, 517; Bird, 5, 400; Roche, 7, 415.

IVTH SUNDAY AFTER PENTECOST

Epistle: Boylan, 1, 519; Bonney, 3, 396; Roche, 7, 417; Anon., 13, 168.

Gospel: Boylan, 1, 520; Bonney, 3, 398; De Ternant, 5, 478; Smith, C.P., 9, 504; Dean 11, 395; Kerr, 14, 508; Graham, 18, 420.

VTH SUNDAY AFTER PENTECOST

Epistle: Boylan, 1, 521; Bonney, 3, 399; Anon, 13, 169; Kerr, 14, 511; Graham, 18, 422.

Gospel: Boylan, 1, 523; Bonney, 3, 401; De Ternant, 5, 479; Roche, 7, 419; Smith, C.P., 9, 505; Kehoe, 11, 477; Anon., 13, 169; McReavy, 16, 521; Steuart, 20, 516.

VITH SUNDAY AFTER PENTECOST

Epistle: Freeland, 1, 615; Bonney, 3, 403; Kehoe, 11, 479; Graham, 18, 423; Dean, 22, 269.

Gospel: Freeland, 1, 616; Bonney, 3, 404; De Ternant, 5, 482; Smith, C.P., 9, 507; Anon., 13, 170; Kerr, 14, 514; McReavy, 16, 523; Steuart, 20, 518.

VIIITH SUNDAY AFTER PENTECOST

Epistle: Freeland, 1, 618; Kehoe, 11, 481; Dean, 22, 271.

Gospel: Freeland, 1, 619; Martindale, 3, 488; De Ternant, 5, 484; Bird, 7, 500; Smith, C.P., 9, 509; Anon., 13, 211; Kerr, 14, 517; McReavy, 16, 526; Graham, 18, 425; Steuart, 20, 520.

VIIIITH SUNDAY AFTER PENTECOST

Epistle: Kehoe, 11, 482; Anon., 13, 212; Albion, 18, 512; Dean, 22, 272.

Gospel: Freeland, 1, 621; Martindale, 3, 489; De Ternant, 5, 486; Bird, 7, 502; Barton, 10, 43; Kerr, 14, 519; McReavy, 16, 528; Steuart, 20, 522.

IXTH SUNDAY AFTER PENTECOST

Epistle: Bonney, 6, 46; Miller, 15, 49; Albion, 18, 513; Dean, 22, 274.

Gospel: Freeland, 1, 622; Martindale, 3, 491; Bonney, 6, 47; Barton, 10, 45; Calnan, 12, 51; Anon., 13, 213; McReavy, 16, 531.

XTH SUNDAY AFTER PENTECOST

Epistle: Bonney, 6, 48; Miller, 15, 51; Albion, 18, 515.

Gospel: Morgan, 2, 58; Martindale, 3, 492; Bonney, 6, 49; Bird, 7, 506; Barton, 10, 47; Calnan, 12, 53; Anon, 13, 214, and 248; Steuart, 17, 44; Turner, 22, 317.

XIITH SUNDAY AFTER PENTECOST

Epistle: Bonney, 6, 51; Miller, 15, 54; Albion, 18, 517.

Gospel: Morgan, 2, 60; Martindale, 3, 493; Bonney, 6, 52; Dean, 8, 43; Barton, 10, 49; Calnan, 12, 56; Anon., 13, 249; Steuart, 17, 46; Turner, 22, 319.

XIIITH SUNDAY AFTER PENTECOST

Epistle: Bonney, 6, 53; Miller, 15, 56.

Gospel: Morgan, 2, 61; Jarrett, 4, 41; Bonney, 6, 54; Calnan, 10, 122 and 12, 58; Anon., 13, 250; Steuart, 17, 48; Martindale, 19, 39; Turner, 22, 320.

XIIIITH SUNDAY AFTER PENTECOST

Epistle: Goodier, 6, 129; Dean, 8, 47; Graham, 21, 88.

Gospel: Morgan, 2, 64; Jarrett, 4, 43; Calnan, 10, 124, and 12, 60; Smith, C.P., 15, 156; Steuart, 17, 51; Martindale, 19, 40; Crawford, 21, 32; Turner, 22, 322.

XIVTH SUNDAY AFTER PENTECOST

Epistle: Goodier, 6, 131; Dean, 8, 49; Shaw, 12, 127.

Gospel: Morgan, 2, 66; Jarrett, 4, 45; Calnan, 10, 126, and 17, 135; Anon., 13, 253; Martindale, 19, 42; Graham, 21, 88; Turner, 22, 323.

XVTH SUNDAY AFTER PENTECOST

Epistle: Goodier, 6, 133.

Gospel: Steuart, 2, 161; Jarrett, 4, 47; Martindale, 8, 130, and 19, 44; Calnan, 10, 128, and 17, 139; Shaw, 12, 129; Smith, C.P., 15, 141; Delaney, 22, 360.

XVITH SUNDAY AFTER PENTECOST

Epistle: Goodier, 6, 135; Shaw, 12, 132; Anon., 13, 291; Smith, C.P., 15, 144; Smith, 19, 127.

Gospel: Steuart, 2, 162; Calnan, 4, 136, and 10, 130, and 17, 142; Martindale, 8, 132; Smith, 19, 127 and 129; Delaney, 22, 362.

XVIIITH SUNDAY AFTER PENTECOST

Epistle: Shaw, 12, 134; Smith, 19, 129; Graham, 21, 94.

Gospel: Steuart, 2, 164; Calnan, 4, 138, and 17, 146; Knox, 6, 219; Martindale, 8, 134; Patten, 10, 214; Delaney, 22, 364.

XVIIIITH SUNDAY AFTER PENTECOST

Epistle: Anon., 12, 221; Barton, 21, 147.

Gospel: Steuart, 2, 166; Calnan, 4, 140; Knox, 6, 220; Martindale, 8, 136; Patten, 10, 216; Anon., 13, 294; Smith, 19, 133; Delaney, 22, 365.

XIXTH SUNDAY AFTER PENTECOST

Epistle: Smith, 19, 135; Barton, 21, 148.

Gospel: Calnan, 2, 255, and 4, 142; Knox, 6, 221; Martindale, 8, 138; Patten, 10, 217; Anon., 12, 223, and 13, 295; Smith, 19, 134; McKenna, 22, 411.

XXTH SUNDAY AFTER PENTECOST

Epistle: Bonney, 8, 217; Smith, 19, 136; Barton, 21, 150.

Gospel: Calnan, 2, 257; Steuart, 4, 225; Knox, 6, 223; Bonney, 8, 218; Anon., 12, 225, and 13, 330; Smith, 19, 137.

XXIITH SUNDAY AFTER PENTECOST

Epistle: Bonney, 8, 219; Bird, 10, 285.

Gospel: Calnan, 2, 259; Steuart, 4, 226; Bonney, 8, 221; Anon., 12, 226, and 13, 331.

XXIIITH SUNDAY AFTER PENTECOST

Epistle: Vonier, 6, 303; Bonney, 8, 222.

Gospel: Calnan, 2, 261, and 15, 326; Steuart, 4, 227; Bonney, 8, 224; Bird, 10, 288; Anon., 13, 332.

XXIIIITH SUNDAY AFTER PENTECOST

Epistle: Vonier, 6, 304; Bonney, 8, 225; Bird, 10, 290; Smith, 21, 219.

Gospel: Knox, 2, 347; Steuart, 4, 229; Bonney, 8, 226; Calnan, 15, 329; Byrne, 17, 326.

LAST SUNDAY AFTER PENTECOST

Epistle: Martindale, 4, 315; Vonier, 6, 309; Smith, 21, 221.

Gospel: Knox, 2, 351; Cartmell, 8, 309; Bird, 10, 292; Anon., 13, 371; Calnan, 15, 332, and 19, 329; Byrne, 17, 334; Smith, 21, 222; Graf, 22, 458.

II. FOR VARIOUS OCCASIONS

FEASTS OF OUR LORD

- Christmas*: Bonney, 4, 395; Barton, 10, 413; Anon., 13, 409; Goodier, 14, 1; Byrne, 15, 423.
Circumcision: Knox, 4, 482; McReavy, 15, 513.
Epiphany: Goodier, 8, 469; Gonne, 10, 460.
Exaltation of the Cross: Smith, C.P., 15, 138; Graham, 21, 90.
Precious Blood: Bird, 7, 499.
Sacred Heart: Bonney, 3, 395; Dean, 9, 429, and 11, 393; Anon., 13, 167; Steuart, 14, 427; Knox, 20, 422; Crawford, 22, 216-21.
Christ the King: Knox, 6, 224; Patten, 10, 219; Crees, 11, 116; Anon., 13, 335; Martindale, 15, 226-37; Telford, 17, 243; Hallett, 19, 237; Barton, 21, 151; McKenna, 22, 416.

FEASTS OF OUR LADY

- In Advent*: Anon., 13, 407.
Advocacy: Kerr, 16, 330.
Assumption: Dean, 8, 45; Anon., 13, 252; Crawford, 21, 28.
Immaculate Conception: Patten, 12, 388.
Maternity: Dean, 14, 41; McKenna, 22, 412.
In May: Bird, 14, 338; Kerr, 16, 321; Hull, 20, 326-42.
Nativity: Smith, 19, 129.
Purification: Gordon, 20, 45.
Rosary: Hallett, 19, 230.
Sorrows: Smith, 19, 132.

FEASTS OF SAINTS

- All Saints*: Smith, 21, 215; Graf, 22, 454 and 456.
All Souls: Graf, 17, 377; Smith, 21, 216; Riös, 21, 249; Bussy, 21, 258.
S. Edward the Confessor: Hallett, 19, 232.
S. George: Mahoney, 20, 198.
Holy Innocents: Finan, 21, 280.
S. John Baptist: Crawford, 21, 30, and 22, 219; Finan, 21, 274-9.
S. Joseph: Anon., 13, 91; Dean, 14, 49.
S. Mary Magdalen: Bird, 7, 504.
S. Matthew: Graham, 21, 92.
SS. Peter and Paul: Knox, 20, 424.

VARIOUS

- Dedication of a Church*: Smith, 21, 217; Mahoney, 22, 117-25.
Four Last Things: Graf, 12, 310-23.
Grace: Patten, 12, 390-4; Steuart, 22, 167.
Mission Sunday: Anon., 13, 334; Telford, 17, 234-43; Hallett, 19, 234; McKenna, 22, 414.

PERMISSU SUPERIORUM